R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 016 720 | UD 004 887

TOWARD A BALANCE SHEET OF PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION.
BY- SENIOR, CLARENCE   WATKINS, DONALD O.

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.32 106P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PUERTO RICANS, *MIGRATION PATTERNS, *URBAN IMMIGRATION, *POPULATION TRENDS, MIGRATION, IMMIGRANTS, FAMILY STRUCTURE, DATA, URBAN AREAS, MIGRANT YOUTH, STUDENTS, UNEMPLOYMENT, ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES, RURAL AREAS, LABOR FORCE, NEW YORK CITY, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, UNITED STATES

PATTERNS OF MIGRATION WITHIN PUERTO RICO AND TO AND FROM THE UNITED STATES ARE EXAMINED IN DEPTH IN THIS DISCUSSION. SUCH PROBLEMS AS THE HIGH MOBILITY OF PUERTO RICAN SCHOOL CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES (NEW YORK CITY ESPECIALLY) AND PUERTO RICAN EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS ARE ELABORATED ON IN THE DISCUSSION, AND DATA ON THE "SELECTIVITY PROCESS" IN MIGRATION IS PRESENTED. IT IS FELT THAT MIGRATING OFFERS THE PUERTO RICAN AND HIS FAMILY MORE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL OPPORTUNITIES THAN THEY HAD PREVIOUSLY. MOREOVER THERE ARE GAINS FOR THE AREA MIGRATED TO AS WELL AS FOR THE AREA FROM WHICH THE MIGRANT HAS DEPARTED BECAUSE OF A REDISTRIBUTION OF MANPOWER ACCORDING TO SUPPLY AND DEMAND. A CRITICALLY ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS, ESSAYS, REPORTS, SPEECHES, AND SURVEYS FOLLOWS THIS DISCUSSION. THIS ARTICLE IS PUBLISHED IN "STATUS OF PUERTO RICO--, SELECTED BACKGROUND STUDIES, FOR THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO," WASHINGTON, D.C., U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, 1966. (LB)

E-1

ED016720

UD 004 887

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TOWARD A BALANCE SHEET OF PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION

by

CLARENCE SENIOR

Professor of Sociology, Brooklyn College

and

DONALD O. WATKINS

Assistant Professor, Brooklyn College

Professor Senior serves as a consultant to the Secretary of Labor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. While director of the Social Science Research Center of the University of Puerto Rico, he made several studies of Puerto Rican migration and has served as director and consultant to various national and international organizations. He is the author of "Puerto Rican Emigration, Strangers—Then Neighbors" and "Americans All: Our Citizens from the Caribbean."

Professor Watkins has served as director of, and consultant to, several social and educational programs. He is also the author of several articles on socio-educational problems.

CONTENTS

Page
I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND 691
  A. United States Experience 691
  B. The Immigration Pattern 692
  C. Return Flow 692
  D. Seasonal Migration 692
  E. Immigration Restriction 693
  F. Internal Population Redistribution 694
  G. Rural-Urban Migration 696
  H. Europe's Recent Migration Experience 697
II. PUERTO RICO'S MIGRATION BACKGROUND 698
  A. Rural-Urban Migration 698
  B. Employment and the Growth of San Juan 699
  C. Metropolis and Hinterland 700
  D. Immigration to Other Countries 701
III. PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES 703
  A. The Timing of the Migration 703
  B. The Question of "Dumping" 704
  C. The Distribution of Puerto Rican Settlement 705
  D. The Family Intelligence Service 706
  E. Selectivity of Migration 707

III. PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES—Continued Page
F. Selectivity of the Puerto Rican Migration 708
G. "Ramp Survey" Data on Selectivity 709
H. Later Data on Selectivity 713
I. Some Problems of Migration Measurement 714
J. The Two Migrations 715
K. Who Goes First? 715
IV. RETURN MIGRATION TO PUERTO RICO 717
A. Who Returns—and Why? 717
B. The Extent of Return Migration 720
C. Temporary Return Migrants 721
D. 1960 Census Data on Returnees 723
E. School Children and Mobility 725
F. Puerto Rican Children in New York City Schools 728
G. School Children in the Return Migration 730
V. PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION IN THE FUTURE 731
A. "Push-Pull" Inadequate 731
B. The Sensitizing Process 733
C. The Magnet 734
D. The Pull Weakens 735
E. How Many Migrants in the Future? 736
VI. PUERTO RICO'S ECONOMY AND FUTURE MIGRATION 737
A. Population and Labor Force Trends 737
B. Unemployment and Underemployment Trends Yesterday and Today 740
C. Unemployment and the Family Structure 741
D. High Unemployment and Job Opportunities 742
VII. THE BALANCE SHEET OF MIGRATION—A POINT OF VIEW 743
A. The Debits of Migration 743
B. The Benefits of Migration 749
C. Summary 756
FOOTNOTES 758
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 765

TABLES

Page
I. Immigrants to the United States, 1820–1965 691
II. Internal Migrants, by State of Residence: 1850–1960, by Decades 695
III. Movers and Migrants, 1948–49 to 1964–65 696
IV. Population and Number of Employees Living in the San Juan Metropolitan Region 700
V. Puerto Rico: Net Migration, to and From the Conterminous United States, 1944–65 703
VI. Persons Born in Puerto Rico, by States, 1950 and 1960; by Numerical Rank in 1960 706
VII. Characteristics of Puerto Ricans in the United States and in Puerto Rico: 1960 710
VIII. Industrial Groupings of 1960 Puerto Rican Employed Persons and 1960 In- and Out-Migrants 711
IX. Occupational Grouping of 1960 Puerto Rican Employed Persons and 1960 In- and Out-Migrants 711
X. Number of Agricultural Workers Referred to U.S. Mainland—1948–64 715

Page
XI. Day Schools—Migration Balance in the Movement of Pupil Population to and From Places Outside New York City, School Years 1953–54 to 1962–63 ... 726
XII. Mobility of Pupil Population, School Years 1958–59 to 1962–63 ... 726
XIII. Puerto Rican and Foreign-Born Pupils, October 31, 1963 ... 728
XIV. Pupils Transferred to and From Mainland School Systems, 1952–53—1963–64 ... 730
XV. Personal Remittances to Puerto Rico, 1947–63 ... 753
XVI. Occupational Distribution of Returnees 1960–64 and Puerto Rican Employment, 1964: Percentages ... 756
XVII. Increase in Employment and Utilization of Returnees, 1960–64 ... 756

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Puerto Rico and the conterminous United States have both had a long history of migration. Both have experienced periods during which the stream of persons seeking better economic opportunities was toward it and others in which it reversed itself. The size of the streams has differed, of course, between the two areas because of their size, their natural resources, and the development of their economies.

Puerto Rico, in its early days, was the scene of a "gold rush," until gold was exhausted. Then restrictions were placed on out-migration. The 19th century saw a return to some in-migration, largely because of the turmoil in other Spanish colonies in the Western Hemisphere and the peaceful states of Puerto Rico.[1]

A. UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE

Table I shows U.S. immigration experience since records were first kept in 1820, by decades. It will be noted that from the 1871–80 decade to the onset of the "Great Depression" almost 60 years later, the decennial inflow was well over the 1951–60 figure. The 1901–10 total rose to about 3½ times that of the most recent decade.

A review of the movement of people to and from the United States and the vast internal movements which have characterized its history will put the Puerto Rican migration in perspective.

TABLE I.—*Immigrants to the United States, 1820–1965*

Period	Immigrant aliens (thousands)	Period	Immigrant aliens (thousands)
1820–30	152	1911–20	5,736
1831–40	599	1921–30	4,107
1841–50	1,713	1931–40	528
1851–60	2,598	1941–50	1,035
1861–70	2,315	1951–60	2,515
1871–80	2,812	1961	271
1881–90	5,247	1962	284
1891–1900	3,688	1963	306
1901–10	8,795	1964	292

Source: Annual Report, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1964, table I.

Much of the immigration of the recent past, however, was not the voluntary movement of persons in search of better economic opportunities. It consisted mostly of refugees and displaced persons, of whom there are still millions in the world. Many of the ancestors of the present population of the United States also made their journey because of man's inhumanity to man; because someone or some institution did not like their religion, their political ideas, or their ancestry; and a significant number because of slavery.

B. THE IMMIGRATION PATTERN

Most immigration to the United States was voluntary and was economic in motivation. Study after study has demonstrated that immigrants came in response to better economic opportunities. With some exceptions, due primarily to involuntary emigration, "the number of arrivals increases in prosperity and falls in depressions," according to the most recent study.[2]

C. RETURN FLOW

It astonishes many persons to learn that there has always been a return migration from the United States in connection with the voluntary migrations. This was noted in the 1860's, for example, when sizable numbers of textile workers from Lancashire, iron moulders from Scotland, and iron and coal miners from other parts of the United Kingdom were reported "returning home."

The return movement has been measured only since the 1870's. Kuznets and Rubin report that:

> For 1878–1897 the ratio of departures to arrivals was about 17 percent; in the period 1808–1914, * * * it exceeded 30 percent. After 1918 it was even higher. For a short period during the depression of the 1930's departures even exceeded arrivals. In general, the number of departures follows a course opposite that of arrivals, falling in prosperity and rising in depressions. The study indicates that foreign labor supply, under conditions of a free in-outflow, might well be regarded as a sort of stabilizing reservoir moderating the business cycle.[3]

D. SEASONAL MIGRATION

Little noted, and not quantified, were the number of workers who came to the United States for short peak seasons of work and then returned to their homes when the demand fell off. This included thousands of British building trade mechanics who "became frequent 'Atlantic migrators', coming to America for the boom months of the year."[4]

Even seasonal farm workers came from Italy, returning in October and November after 8 or 9 months of work. According to one document:

> * * * they form a stream of workers that ebbs and flows from Italy to America in instant response to demand * * * More than 98,000 Italians—laborers and others, but chiefly laborers—went back to Italy in 1903. In 1904, owing to a temporary lull in our prosperity * * * the demand slackened * * * In the end, more than 134,000 Italians returned to Italy within the year, and we were saved the problem of an army of unemployed.[5]

E. IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION

Two social phenomena which are ageless and universal are ethnocentrism and xenophobia. Both were deeply involved in the restrictive legislation which was passed by the U.S. Congress in 1924. Ethnocentrism is a generalized emotional feeling that one's own group knows the correct and only really moral ways of living and that "strangers," with different manners and morals, are inferior. Many aboriginal tribes called themselves by a word meaning "people"; all others were, by implication, "non-people." When man seldom met anyone from another ethnic group, this attitude was not viciously antisocial. But as the number of people in the world increased from small groups scattered around the globe to over 3 billion at the present time, ethnocentrism becomes an antisocial guide to action. Xenophobia, the pathological intensification of ethnocentrism, is defined by psychiatrists as a "morbid fear of strangers." The combination of ethnocentrism and xenophobia which has most often expressed itself in the United States is racist feeling, the idea that it is the so-called "white" race which has made the only contributions of any value to the building of civilization. It easily gets confused with religion, social customs, manners, dress, personal habits, and other matters which are in no way intrinsically related to race.

Racism, a witches' brew of false analogies between animal and plant genetics and human inheritance, of spurious reasoning from the mythical history of a nonexistent "Nordic race", of Brahmin endeavor to maintain social status, of misinterpreted Darwinism, and of amateurish anthropology, flavored with wartime hysteria and postwar xenophobia, was written into the Federal statutes by the national origins and quota laws.

The first was vetoed by Wilson in his final days in office but was signed by Harding. The flood tide of racism is represented by the Immigration Act of 1924, fixing annual quotas at 2 percent of each foreign-born group resident in the United States in 1890. The Immigration and Naturalization Service "Monthly Review" in January 1947 pointed out that:

> In its broader sense the National Origins Plan was intended to preserve the racial composition of the United States through the selection of immigrants from those countries whose traditions, language, and political systems were akin to those in this country.

The tragedy of racist thinking and political action based on ideas of "racial composition" lies not only in the pervasive damage it does in human relations. Tragedy lies also in the damage it does to thinking honestly and effectively. The scientific method gives no support whatsoever to the myth that there are any racial "traditions, languages (or), political systems," or any other human behavior which is biologically determined. Race has no scientific meaning except as a biological concept. Specifically, the meaning of skin color for human beings resides exclusively in the reaction of other persons to that color, and never in the color itself. An exact analogy is the color of one's hair; skin color has neither more nor less intrinsic meaning.

In spite of attempts by the restrictionists, the Western Hemisphere was not included in the national origins plan. Thus, except for the special war and postwar charity cases of displaced persons, refugees, etc., a large part of immigration in recent years has come from Canada and Latin America. This was an unforeseen consequence of restriction. Another unforeseen consequence was the speeding up of internal population redistribution throughout the United States. The Puerto Rican who migrates to the conterminous United States is part of that movement.

F. INTERNAL POPULATION REDISTRIBUTION

A sizable proportion of the population of the United States has been moving in search of better economic opportunity since the first immigrants arrived early in the 1600's. The first handful, only 210 in 1610, were gradually replenished by new waves of immigrants until the 3 million square miles of the conterminous area were occupied according to the carrying capacity of the land. But that carrying capacity varies according to its innate qualities plus the technology which is applied to it by its occupants. Farming land "wears out," in the old "laissez faire" phrase; translated this means that the soil was abused and has lost its fertility or even that poor farming practices have resulted in loss of the top soil itself through erosion. Coal, iron, and other minerals and metals are mined out. Technology changes transportation practices, and cities in which large populations depended on the servicing and repair of steam locomotives now are only passenger stops for diesel engines. Economic change, which benefits some and harms others, has been built into modern industrial civilization and only those few who are isolated from the main currents of present-day life are immune to its effects.

People move primarily in response to imbalances in the economic system which result in fewer job opportunities in one place and labor scarcities in another. There are other reasons, of course, but unless persons are in the pre- or post-productive stage of life, jobs are the magnet which determines most moves. Our own experience shows that there are almost invariably four major factors present in voluntary migrations. They are: ambition, courage, hope, and differential economic opportunities.

Only the last can be quantified, tabulated, and put on graphs, at least in the present state of our knowledge. Anyone who has ever worked with migrants, however, cannot doubt the strength of the human factors.

The movements of internal migrants, as distinguished from immigrants, who cross national boundaries in their journeys, have been recorded in the United States since 1850.[6]

Close to one person in five of the total population has changed his residence from one State to another, according to each census count since 1850. The exact percentages and numbers are shown in table II. It will be noted that the ratios in 1950 and 1960 were closer to one in four who had moved; i.e., 23.5 and 24.8 percent. And the actual number is now over 10 times what it was in 1850.

The decennial census state-of-birth data may well underestimate considerably the actual migration in the United States. Persons may move to Illinois from Kentucky, for instance, in the year following the census and return to their old home the year before the next census. They may, indeed, move back and forth several times. Or, they may migrate to their new home and die before the next census is taken.

Table II.—*Internal migrants, by State of residence: 1850–1960, by decades*

Census year	Total population	Born in other State	Born in other State as percent of total population
1850	19,987,563	4,251,250	21.3
1860	27,489,561	5,774,434	21.[illegible]
1870	38,558,371	7,657,320	19.9
1880	50,155,783	9,592,764	19.1
1890	62,622,250	11,094,108	17.7
1900	75,994,575	13,501,045	17.8
1910	91,972,266	16,910,114	18.4
1920	105,710,620	20,274,450	19.2
1930	122,775,046	25,388,100	20.7
1940	131,669,275	26,905,986	20.4
1950	150,216,110	35,284,210	23.5
1960	178,466,732	44,263,882	24.8

Source: 1960 Census of Population, "State of Birth." Final Rept. PC(2)-2A, p. 1.

It is for this reason that data on internal migration have been collected annually since 1949. Each recent year over 30 million persons have moved their homes (see table III). Most move within the same county; around 20 million. About 5 million migrate across county lines but stay within the same State. Around another 5 million mi-

TABLE III.—*Movers and Migrants 1948–49 to 1964–65*

[In thousands]

Year	Total	Persons moving their homes		
		Within same county	From one county to another in same State	From one State to another
1948–49	27,127	18,792	3,992	4,344
1949–50	27,526	19,276	4,360	3,889
1950–51	31,158	20,694	5,276	5,188
1951–52	29,840	19,874	4,854	5,112
1952–53	30,786	20,638	4,626	5,522
1953–54	29,027	19,046	4,947	5,034
1954–55	31,492	21,086	5,511	4,895
1955–56	33,098	22,186	5,859	5,053
1956–57	31,834	21,566	5,192	5,076
1957–58	33,263	22,023	5,656	5,584
1958–59	32,804	22,315	5,419	5,070
1959–60	33,811	22,564	5,724	5,523
1960–61	35,535	24,289	5,493	5,753
1961–62	34,364	23,341	5,461	5,562
1962–63	35,411	23,059	5,712	6,640
1963–64	36,327	24,089	6,191	6,047
1964–65	37,866	25,122	6,597	6,147

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, "Current Population Reports," Series P–20, No. 150, Apr. 14, 1966. Surveys made immediately following V–J Day showed quite similar results.

grate across State boundaries. Usually about two-thirds of the interstate migrants move their homes between noncontiguous States.

The States vary widely in their migration experience, as do the counties within the States. A majority of the States have lost population through migration during the past two census periods. Over half of the 3,072 counties in the United States lost population during the 1950–60 decade. Five of the nine major geographical divisions of the continental United States have lost population in recent years: New England, Middle Atlantic, West North Central, East South Central and West South Central. The four which have gained are Pacific, Mountain, South Atlantic and East North Central. These are also the four in which the greatest expansion in employment opportunities has been taking place.

G. RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION

The migration from farms to cities in the United States is equally noteworthy. The first census in 1790 showed 5 percent of the population living in urban areas. The Nation is now 75 percent urban. The first census reported 24 localities classified as urban; the 1850 census, 236; and that of 1900 found 1,737. By 1950 there were 4,741; and by 1960 there were 6,015. Urban population rose 30 percent between 1950 and 1960, but the rural population showed its first absolute decline in the history of the United States, about 1 percent.

The growth of cities is a worldwide phenomenon; what has been called the "flight from the land" is also worldwide. Urban concentrations of people are nothing new in world history, but the rapidity, extent and size of the present growth and the decline of the importance of agriculture as a source of employment is new.

A recent survey by the International Labor Office showed declines in the absolute numbers of persons employed on the land in 15 of the 25 major nations for which adequate data were available, plus relative declines in all the others.[7]

The 1820 U.S. census found 72 percent of the labor force working on farms, which is close to India's present-day percentage of 74. The U.S. proportion today is below 10 percent. Many factors have been listed as leading to the great increase in urban populations: increased division of labor, specialization which heightened technological development has both demanded and fostered, the use of man's nonhuman "slaves" for producing and using energy, what economists call economies of scale and external economies, etc.[8]

The most significant factor from our standpoint is that jobs increased in the urban areas while they decreased in the rural areas. In addition, lower levels of schooling resulted in higher rural birth rates even though employment opportunities were contracting. Young men and young women thus became one of the major "farm crops" for export to the cities on demand. Generally, throughout the United States farms annually produce a "surplus" of at least 40 percent of the young men who reach working age.[9] Such States as North and South Carolina and New Mexico produce an even larger annual "surplus."

Whether the people who cannot find a means of livelihood, move to the city or not, depends primarily on whether job opportunities are becoming available in the city. Otherwise, they stay in the rural areas and share the poverty.

II. EUROPE'S RECENT MIGRATION EXPERIENCE

These generalizations about rural-urban migration in the United States find an echo in recent reports on the migration from the less-developed areas of Europe to that Continent's industrialized, urbanized northwest. A New York Times headline puts the story succinctly: "4 Million Workers Migrate in Europe." The article explains that:

> From the Mediterranean countries for the most part—from Italy and Spain at first, then from Portugal and Greece, from Algeria for political reasons, and now from faraway Turkey and Yugoslavia—millions of men and women have moved north and west.

The flow is quantified as follows:

> The current migration began in the mid-nineteen-fifties, but it did not really soar until about five years ago, when the booming North had absorbed virtually all of its unemployment and could go no further without new manpower. South-

5

> ern Italy, Sicily and Spain, historically poor and traditionally sources of emigration to North and South America, provided the needed supply.
>
> The spectacular growth shows in the following figures on Italian migration to West Germany—from 6500 in 1954 to 144,000 in 1960 and an estimated total of 372,000 this year.
>
> Italy continues to be by far West Germany's biggest supplier. It is an even greater supplier to Switzerland—almost 450,000. Swiss construction foremen must speak Italian to be understood, a builder says.
>
> Turkey supplied no labor at all to West Germany before 1960. There are 12,000 Turks here now, ranking fourth after Italy, Greece and Spain.
>
> In fifth place is Yugoslavia, with 64,000.[10]
>
> "Surplus" population on the farms of Eastern and Southern Europe is an old story; outlets for it have been few since the doors of the classic immigrant-receiving countries began to close wiith the restrictive legislation in the United States in the mid-1920's, followed by similar moves in other nations, and the worldwide depression of the 1930's. It was not until the war and postwar periods had been traversed that immigration possibilities began to open. Then, ironically, the immigrant-receiving countries turned out to be the major emigration areas of the past.[11]

The difficulties of country and small town people in the big cities of northwestern Europe sound most familiar to anyone conversant with the immigration history of the United States and with recent internal migration experience here. Housing is almost universally listed in first place. Then follow questions related to absence from family, hostile reactions on the part of some local inhabitants, lack of recreation facilities, different foods, adjustment to time clocks and punctuality rules and other aspects of industrial discipline, proper disposal of waste, etc.[12]

Migration as a temporary expedient in cases of overpopulation when sources of employment exist within a feasible distance is again proving its utility to both the sending and receiving countries.

II. Puerto Rico's Migration Background

Puerto Rico's population contains an even smaller proportion of its original inhabitants than does that of the United States. Almost everyone is a descendant of an immigrant. The national strains, however, are not nearly as numerous and thus the immigration histories differ somewhat.

A. RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION

Internal migration differs in scope, of course, but the patterns are quite similar. Some of the island's "municipios" have gained; others have lost population. And, of course, the urban population has grown rapidly.

The decade 1930–40 found 54 of the 77 municipios losing population. Thirty-three lost 10 percent or more of their 1930 population and 6 lost 20 percent or more.[13]

Data do not seem to be available for the 1940–50 period, but the 1950–60 decade showed a loss by 39 municipios; 12 of them lost more than 10 percent of their 1950 population. Seven gained 25 percent or more: Bayamon, Carolina, Catano, Guaynabo, San Juan, Toa Baja, and Trujillo Alto. It is significant that all seven are actually part of the San Juan metropolitan area. Ponce made a small gain in population but Mayagüez and Arecibo, the other two of the first four cities lost.[14]

There are now 55 cities in Puerto Rico, compared with 17 in 1899. The urban proportion of the population has risen as follows:

	Percent
1899	14.6
1910	20.1
1920	21.8
1930	27.7
1940	30.3
1950	40.5
1960	44.2

The 1960 figure probably heavily understates the proportion living under urban conditions, since "urbanizaciones" many times extend beyond the official city limits.

The general pattern of decline in rural population shows the heaviest losses in the coffee region and the eastern offshore islands. However, a total of 38 municipios had a smaller rural population in 1960 than they had in 1950. Rural people were 0.4 percent fewer in 1960 than at the start of the decade, while urbanites increased by 16.1 percent, compared with a rise in the total population of 6.3 percent. Since fertility is higher in rural than in urban areas in Puerto Rico, as it is in most parts of the world, and since most of the new industries are in urban areas, it is obvious that out-migration is one of the solutions to the economic problems of the ruralite here as it is elsewhere. In addition, technology is reducing the number of workers needed to plant, cultivate, and harvest farm products. Average annual employment in agriculture in 1964 was 90,000 less than in 1940. The total value of farm products, however, rose from $84 million in 1940 to $280 million in 1960.[15]

B. EMPLOYMENT AND THE GROWTH OF SAN JUAN

It has been seen that the most spectacular urban growth has taken place in the San Juan area. The previous statement which have stressed that it is job opportunities which determine the flow of migration are borne out by the statistics on the growth of population and employment in the San Juan metropolitan area between 1940 and 1960 (see table IV).

The 1960 census data probably understate the number of employees working in the San Juan metropolitan area, since they do not include what is likely to be a sizable number who live outside the area and commute to work.

TABLE IV.—*Population and number of employees living in the San Juan metropolitan region*

Item	Census 1940	Census 1950	Census 1960
Population	338, 537	508, 570	647, 979
Employed	91, 551	137, 544	180, 028
Ratio of population to employment	3.7	3.7	3. 6

Source: "1961 Economic Report to the Governor." Santurce: Puerto Rico Planning Board, p. 80.

C. METROPOLIS AND HINTERLAND

Economic and social realities often disregard political action. Arturo Morale Carrión has shown how Spanish exclusivism was finally worn down and defeated by Puerto Rican insistence on trading with the 13 Colonies of the British Empire which were situated on the eastern coast of what is now the United States.[16] It was from them that the Puerto Ricans could secure the flour and other commodities they needed. A sizable commerce had sprung up even before the formation of the United States. Such commerce, it might be expected, would lead to the movement of persons as well as food. It did. Two "straws in the wind" give us an idea even though we cannot quantify the movement until the early years of the 20th century. "By May, 1816," writes Morales, "83 immigrants had arrived from Louisiana," under a new colonialization law.[17] Ernst reports the existence in New York City in the 1830's of a "Spanish Benevolent Society" supported by Cuban and Puerto Rican merchants.[18]

Over the years a metropolis grew in what had been the 13 Colonies based on both commercial relationships with most of the world and the movement of persons from much of the world. Just as San Juan has grown by contributions of people born and raised in its hinterland—the remainder of Puerto Rico—so has the United States grown by contributions of people born and raised in its hinterland—which includes Puerto Rico as a whole. And of course, within the United States as a whole there is a metropolis-hinterland relationship between many urban centers and rural areas. The essence of this relationship is reciprocity. The metropolis offers economic opportunities which are superior to those of the hinterland, and often other opportunities such as education.

Thus we find indications early in this century, of migration of Puerto Ricans to the United States. The first census to give any data was in

1910; 1,513 persons born in Puerto Rico living in 39 States of the Union, plus several times that number in the Territory of Hawaii.

Forty-five States reported the presence of Puerto Rican-born persons in 1920 and all 48 did so in the 1930, 1940, and 1950 censuses. The 1960 census found Puerto Ricans in all 50 States. The number and increase over the decade have been as follows, by censuses:[19]

		Percent
1910	1, 513	----
1920	11, 811	680
1930	52, 774	347
1940	69, 967	33
1950	226, 110	223
1960	615, 384	172

D. IMMIGRATION TO OTHER COUNTRIES

News articles now and then attest to the existence of small communities of Puerto Ricans in some of the American republics. An attempt at colonization of Puerto Ricans in the Mexican state of Tabasco, about 1907 or 1908, has been mentioned. Inquiry in the state capital, Villahermosa, did not yield further information. Recruitment for cane cutting in Cuba was carried on in December 1919, and January 1920. Representatives of a private employment agency enlisted 671 persons to work in the Central Preston. Central Rio Cauto had recruited 16 in October 1919. No other indication of Cuban recruitment was found.

Central Montellano of the Dominican Republic took 10 mechanics in July 1920. Five years later two fairly small groups were recruited to work on the Santa Marta coffee plantation in Colombia. No notice of other organized recruitment programs has been found aside from those for the continent, Hawaii and St. Croix.[20] Neither of the latter appears to offer opportunities for large numbers of migrants in the future.

No sizable migration has developed to Latin America and the chances are great that none will develop. The Latin American nations almost all have serious restrictions on immigration and require either a high degree of skill for certain specialized jobs or the investment of a fairly substantial sum of money by the immigrant. Mexico even has a sliding scale geared to the size of the city in which the immigrant would live!

Many hundreds of farm colonization failures and a handful of successes have proved that two prerequisites for success are always found: (1) A heavy investment per family and (2) exceedingly careful selection of the participants. The successful Dutch farm colonies in Brazil in the 1940's required an investment of $12,000 to $14,000 per family.[21] Undoubtedly the cost has risen.

Even more serious than these handicaps is the fact that Latin America is the fastest growing region in the world and it is having great difficulties expanding its economy fast enough to keep pace with population growth.[22] Aside from specialized occupations and from farm labor, which their own people increasingly refuse to perform, the natural growth of the population more than supplies labor needs. And all of the Latin American republics have lower levels of living than Puerto Rico.

The prospects for the future are not bright in most Latin American countries. The area's rate of population growth is above that of Puerto Rico: 2.7 percent per year. United Nations population figures and projections give an idea of what lies ahead for 20 republics with peoples at least two-thirds of whom are "ill-fed, ill-housed, or ill-clothed:"

	Million
1950	163
1960	206
1970	265
1975	303
2000	592

The 20 republics will face during the next 25 years the enormous task of finding jobs for 90 million new members of the labor forces, according to Prebisch. About 25 million will replace those who die or retire, but it will be necessary to create 65 million new jobs.

Even Mexico, which is making greater industrial advances than any other Latin American nation, and has greater natural resources than most of them, has in recent years sometimes fallen behind in per-capita income. It also is faced with such a high rate of unemployment that it had been forced to "export" some 400,000 braceros a year to the United States for seasonal farm work until such work was almost stopped by new farm legislation in 1964–65. And Mexico has the immense advantage of having gone through its agrarian revolution. This formidable task still faces many of the Latin American countries. If the landowners are capable of learning anything from the French, Russian, Mexican, and Cuban revolutions, this may not result in the bloodshed and destruction which wracked Mexico for 11 years and left it exhausted for many more.

Mexico still has more than half its people illiterate. Therefore the birth rate is high, one of the highest in Latin America: 45 per thousand. And Mexico contains only a small proportion of the 80 million illiterates in Latin America.

It is clear why there has been little Puerto Rican immigration to Latin America. Prospects for the future do not seem encouraging. Let us turn, therefore, to Puerto Rico's one major external job market of the past.

III. Puerto Rican Migration to the United States

A. THE TIMING OF THE MIGRATION

Two of the most important factors in the Puerto Rican migration to the United States are (1) the numbers involved and (2) the timing of phases of the movement. Timing is of the greatest importance in understanding the migration and will be dealth with first. Year after year, since statistics were first kept (in the fiscal year 1908–09), the net migration to the United States has risen during times of low unemployment and fallen in times of high unemployment. The Columbia University study in 1948 computed the coefficient of correlation between the business cycle on the mainland and the ebb and flow of the migration stream at 0.73, an exceedingly high correlation for any two series of social statistics.[23]

The annual average net migration grouped by years shows the phenomenon:

Years	*Per year*
1909–1930	1,986
1931–1940	984
1941–1950	18,794
1951–1960	41,212
1961–1964	1,200

It is obvious that the depression decade of the 1930's cut the average by more than 50 percent. As a matter of fact, the year-by-year record from 1909 to 1965 shows that there have been 14 years in which there was a net return flow to Puerto Rico: 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1916, 1921, 1922, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1961, and 1963. These were all years of high unemployment in the United States.

TABLE V.—*Puerto Rico: Net migration, to and from the conterminous United States, 1944–65*

1944	11,000
1945	13,000
1946	39,911
1947	24,551
1948	32,775
1949	25,698
1950	34,703
1951	52,899
1952	59,103
1953	69,124
1954	21,531
1955	45,464
1956	52,315
1957	37,704
1958	27,690
1959	29,989
1960	16,298
1961	[1]−1,754
1962	11,664
1963	[1]−5,479
1964	1,370
1965	16,678

[1] The minus figure represents a net outflow from the United States to Puerto Rico.

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, San Juan office.

The year of the largest net migration was 1953 but the recession which developed late that year resulted in a 69 percent drop in the migration between 1953 and 1954. There was a net migratiton to Puerto Rico in 1961 of 1,754 persons and in 1963 of 5,479 persons, according to the statistics of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, which has been the sources of all the statistics from 1908–09 to the present. We will return to questions about these statistics later. First, we must clear up a point which has aroused a great deal of emotion.

B. THE QUESTION OF "DUMPING"

One of the disquieting aspects of migration universally is the community hostility with which newcomers are so often met. This has been true throughout the history of the United States, but it is by no means confined to the United States.[24] Nor does it apply only to Puerto Ricans, of course. What concerns us now is the specific charge that Puerto Rico feels that "it must dump hundreds of thousands—eventually, millions—of unwanted sons and daughters on the continent, or elsewhere."[25]

The generally excellent critique of certain publications of the planning board by a Minnesota sociologist is marred by this emotional reference. Two comments seem in order. First, Puerto Rico has no means of dumping people on the continent or anywhere else, except that used by Germany, England, and Ireland in the past to scoop up inmates of debtors' and other prisons or almshouses and pay their passage to the United States. Puerto Rico has not done this.

No one in the Puerto Rican Government has indicated any inclination to carry out such a program. It would be contrary to the general Puerto Rican belief in the inherent dignity of the individual, even if the economic means to do so were available. As a matter of fact, the law governing the subject states that the Government will "neither encourage nor discourage migration."

Second, the evidence is overwhelming that the vast majority of the Puerto Ricans who come to the United States came because they were needed in the economic machinery of the areas to which they went and they went when they were needed. A few years ago, for example, the economist for the local utility company in New York City estimated that about 3 million of the city's 8-million inhabitants depended, directly or indirectly, on the needle trades for a livelihood. And the Harvard study of the economy of the New York Metropolitan region found the needle trades and other industries heavily dependent on the Puerto Rican migrant for a reliable and capable labor supply. It reported that:

The rate of Puerto Rican migration to New York is one of the factors that determine how long and how successfully the New York metropolitan region will retain industries which are under competitive pressure from other areas. To the extent that some of these industries have hung on in the area, they have depended on recently arrived Puerto Rican workers, who have entered the job market of the New York area at the rate of about 13,000 each year. But the New York area is beginning to lose its unique position as the first stopping-off place for Puerto Rican in-migrants; this stream of migration is now spreading to other mainland areas as well, and the spread promises to accelerate.[26]

C. THE DISTRIBUTION OF PUERTO RICAN SETTLEMENT

New York's share of the Puerto Rican migration to the continental United States has varied with the requirements of the labor market. Since 1910 the following have been the percentages of Puerto Rican-born persons in the United States living in New York City:

	Number	Percent
1910	554	37
1920	7,364	62
1930	44,908	81
1940	61,463	88
1950	187,420	83
1960	429,710	70

Where else did Puerto Ricans live in 1960? Table VI names the top 20 States and shows how the numbers of Puerto Rican-born persons increased in each one from 1950 to 1960. Hawaii, ranked as the last of the 20 States in Puerto Rican population, once had the largest concentration of Puerto Ricans living away from their island. Some 6,000 sugarcane workers had been brought to Hawaii in 1900 and 1901 to work in the cane fields there. They were shipped by boat to New York, taken by train to San Francisco, and transshipped again to reach Hawaii. Some decided they had traveled enough by the time they reached the west coast; they formed the nucleus of a Puerto Rican community in California. Some returned to San Francisco from Hawaii. Most of them stayed, but recent years have seen the Puerto Rican population disappearing from the census returns. Census definitions include only first- and second-generation migrants. More and more of those of Puerto Rican origin are third generation and thus are no longer counted.[27] Hawaii was the only important State in 1960 where the second generation outnumbered the first.

Every major study of internal, voluntary migration in the United States has found that overwhelmingly it is the "pull" of job opportunities which is the major factor in the dynamics of migration. And that "pull" is selective. It attracts those who are most needed at the time and place involved.

Neither the verb "dump" nor the adjective "unwanted" is justified in the quotation cited from "The Predictive Process." There are, of course, prejudiced persons in every community; an exception would have to be made in their case with reference to the adjective "unwanted."

D. THE FAMILY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

The Puerto Rican family is, in general, a closely-knit group and usually includes the extended compadrazgo. It is the family which serves to gear together the demand for additional workers in an area and the flow of Puerto Ricans to that area. The family is responsible for the high coefficient of correlation between employment and migration.

TABLE VI.—*Persons born in Puerto Rico, by States, 1950 and 1960; by numerical rank in 1960*

State	1950	1960
New York	191,305	448,585
New Jersey	4,055	39,779
Illinois	3,000	25,843
California	5,495	15,479
Pennsylvania	2,560	14,659
Florida	3,090	14,245
Connecticut	900	11,172
Ohio	1,710	9,227
Indiana	1,520	4,781
Texas	1,210	3,869
Massachusetts	775	3,454
Wisconsin	230	2,552
Michigan	1,120	2,175
Virginia	850	2,031
Maryland	925	1,904
Georgia	475	1,737
North Carolina	230	1,300
Washington	505	1,280
Louisiana	715	1,204
Hawaii	3,092	1,197

Source: 1960 Census of Population, State of Birth, PC(2)2A; Puerto Ricans in the United States, PC(2) 1D.

The Department of Labor of Puerto Rico since 1948 has worked with the U.S. Employment Service to discover those areas of the mainland where labor shortages were developing and where workers from Puerto Rico could make a contribution to the solution of such shortages. Its activities will be touched on later. Let me record here the role played by "the family intelligence service." Time after time, the Migration Division of the Puerto Rico Department of Labor located jobs for a group of workers in some town or city and found, a few years later, that the original group of 30 or 40 had grown to a community of 2,000 to 3,000 Puerto Ricans! Upon inquiry, the same mechanism would always be found at work. The foreman of the plant, needing more workers and impressed by the productivity of the Puerto Rican workers would ask one, "Are there any more at home like you?"! Within a few days, a brother or uncle or "compadre" would appear to fill the waiting job! The most dramatic illustration known to the authors of the power of this system involves a young mechanic from Lares who went to work in a garage in a small New York town. Within 2 years, there were about 900 Larenos in that and nearby towns—and they all came from the same barrio! Dozens of sizable Puerto Rican communities have grown in exactly this manner.

The division has also seen the reverse of this process operating. It has found jobs, through the U.S. Employment Service, for anywhere from 50 to 100 workers in a town and then learned that new jobs did not open up; the community therefore did not grow. In two cases, some of the original jobs eventually disappeared and the Puerto Rican community lost members.

A recession leads to the same experience. Youngstown, Ohio, which had about 3,000 Puerto Ricans in early 1953 had only about 900 a year later because of the recession, or "rolling readjustment," depending on one's politics. The remainder largely returned to Puerto Rico to wait for word that their jobs were again open. The 1960 census reported 1,820 persons of Puerto Rican birth in Youngstown.[28]

E. SELECTIVITY OF MIGRATION

All migrations are selective in one respect or another. But there are no general laws of selectivity which apply to all streams of migration. Generally, migrations are selective of the younger adult population. Often there is an educational and occupational selection. The latter was found to be true for the internal migration in Puerto Rico between 1935 and 1940, for example. Professional and semiprofessional persons were found in the migrant stream far out of proportion to their percentage of the population (migrants, 7.0 percent; total, 2.8 percent). Service personnel were also represented to a far higher degree among the migrants, but the opposite was true of farm laborers and farmers.[29] This, of course, was to be expected, since it is conditions in the receiving labor market which largely determine the flow, including its size and its composition.

A more recent study of internal migration in Puerto Rico found another aspect of selectivity: that among farm workers. Peter Gregory reports on a study of a sample of workers in new industries in Puerto Rico as follows:

> Those who had left agriculture were not forced to do so to escape a marginal existence. Indeed, our sample of workers appear to have been among the elite in the agricultural wage labor force * * * these were the most employable of the agricultural workers; not those marginal to that work force.[30]

Many studies have shown the relation between labor market conditions in the receiving area and educational selectivity. The conclusions reached by one such study, of Weakley County, Tenn., are particularly relevant:

> It is evident that the level of education of migrants from the county changed considerably with changes in business conditions. During the full-employment years—1946–51—education was not significantly associated with migration from farms in Weakley County. This implies, of course, that out-migration before 1946 was strongly biased in favor of the better educated. With the exception of the war years, most of the period before 1946 covered in this study was one of depression. This strongly suggests that there is a causal relationship between levels of employment and educational characteristics of off-farm migration from the county. The tendency for only the better educated farm youths to migrate during the period prior to 1946 was apparently associated with a lack of employment opportunities in industry for those with little education. With the coming of full employment in the period of postwar prosperity, the educational selectivity in off-farm migration disappeared.[31]

F. SELECTIVITY OF THE PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION

Not enough is known about the selectivity process in the Puerto Rican migration, but enough is known to enable us to affirm that there is such a process and to give some of the results. The first evidence came in 1948 from the Columbia study of the Puerto Ricans in New York City.[32] The employment background in Puerto Rico of the migrants to New York City is especially revealing of the selectivity in those days. Only 5 percent of the migrants in the labor force had ever worked in agriculture, for example, although in the 1950–51 fiscal year 34 percent of the labor force in Puerto Rico was engaged in agriculture. Comparisons of the four major sectors is given in tabular form below:

	Migrants (percent)	Puerto Rico (percent)
Agriculture	5	34
Manufacturing and processing	48	23
Trade and transportation	14	21
Services	33	23

Skill levels are also most revealing. Comparisons of the migrant labor force with the Puerto Rican labor force at home in 1940 give a rough idea of this aspect of the selection process:

	Migrants (percent)	Puerto Rico (percent)
White collar	21	25
Skilled	18	5
Semiskilled	35	20
Unskilled	26	50

Literacy among the migrants was 93 percent in 1948, compared with about 74 percent in Puerto Rico. Urban background was 91 percent, contrasted with 40 percent on the island. The overwhelming majority of the migrants (82 percent) came from the island's three largest cities and had been born and raised in those cities. A big majority had been employed for at least 2 years before they left Puerto Rico and most of them left jobs to go to the States.

The 1940 census gives us a few more facts about selectivity. Persons of Puerto Rican birth living in the States were found to have over twice the average years of schooling completed by Puerto Ricans living in Puerto Rico. This ratio was reduced during the 1950–60 decade. Our hypothesis is that this reflects the effect of family solidarity which resulted in the "pioneers" bringing to the United States more "followers" as they got settled and were able to support persons younger and not in the labor force. It also reflects the increased proportion of migrants from rural areas. In any case, the 1960 census showed the characteristics of first- and second-generation Puerto Ricans in the United States as compared with the population of Puerto Rico found in table VII.

One other factor might be noted in passing. Each census in recent years has shown that the migration is more heavily white than in the population of the island. The 1950 census figure was 7.7 percent nonwhite for migrants in the United States as a whole while the proportion in Puerto Rico was listed as 20.3 percent. The New York City proportion was listed in the respective censuses as 11.7 percent nonwhite in 1940; 9.6 percent in 1950; and 4 percent in 1960.[33]

We do not know whether this selective factor works through a process in which fewer nonwhite persons leave the island or whether the out-migration is more or less representative of the color composition of the island but that more nonwhites return proportionately than do whites. That the latter was true of at least the specific migration organized by the War Manpower Commission during World War II was indicated by a study of that group in 1946.[34]

G. "RAMP SURVEY" DATA ON SELECTIVITY

The inadequacies of the "net migration" approach, to which we shall return, led to the institution of a survey of outgoing and incoming passenger at International Airport which began in 1957 and was terminated in 1962.[35] The ramp survey distinguished between residents and visitors.

Age

Much data on selectivity is available in the results of the ramp survey. Age, as would be expected, is the most obvious. The net out-migration of residents from 1957 through 1960 contained 73.1 percent of persons of the most productive age; i.e., between 15 and 44. The 1961 data, which are reported with a slightly different age breakdown, contained 76 percent between 15 and 24.

TABLE VII.—*Characteristics of Puerto Ricans in the United States and in Puerto Rico: 1960*

Item	United States			Puerto Rico
	Total	Puerto Rican birth	Puerto Rican parentage [1]	
Total population				
Males per 100 females	100.0	99.3	101.8	98.0
Median age	21.4	27.9	5.9	18.4
Persons 14 years old and over				
Median years of school completed:				
Male	8.4	8.2	10.3	6.1
Female	8.2	8.0	10.8	5.6
Percent in labor force:				
Male	79.6	80.6	70.2	65.7
Female	36.3	36.3	36.0	20.0
Median income	$2,533	$2,513	$2,868	$819
Percent single:				
Male	31.1	29.2	48.8	37.4
Female	21.9	20.1	39.2	28.6
Percent widowed or divorced:				
Male	3.0	3.1	2.5	4.2
Female	10.6	11.1	5.1	12.5
Percent enrolled in school:				
Persons 5 to 24 years old	59.8	50.8	77.5	55.4
Persons 16 and 17 years old	61.2	58.0	74.9	47.1

[1] Born in the United States, of one or both Puerto Rican-born parents.

Source: 1960 Census of Population, "Puerto Ricans in the United States," PC(2)1D, 1963, p. viii.

Sex

Sex has had a varied significance as a factor in selectivity. The Columbia study found that the earlier migration to New York City had been heavily weighted toward the female side.[36] This probably was a reflection of the greater job opportunities for women in New York City's needle trade industries. The ramp survey indicated that recent years have seen a swing toward a male surplus in the net out-migration. The years 1957–61 saw 283,600 males in the net outflow of residents to 222,100 females.

Residence

An extremely important shift has taken place in the area of origin of the out-migrants. The Columbia study found that 82 percent of the migrants in New York City had originated in the island's three largest cities, as follows:

	Percent
San Juan	50
Ponce	20
Mayagüez	12

The 1958–61 ramp survey found around 33 percent from the San Juan Metropolitan area, but Ponce and Mayagüez accounted for only about 6 percent and 4 percent respectively. The migration of these years was much more widely representative of the island geographically than it was in 1948 and previous years.

Labor Force

Industrial and occupational selectivity may now be less adverse to Puerto Rico than formerly if we may judge by a comparison of the major industrial and occupational groupings of employed persons in the 1960 census with the affiliations of the 1960 in- and out-migrants. They are given in tables VIII and IX, in percentages.

TABLE VIII.—*Industrial groupings of 1960 Puerto Rican employed persons and 1960 in- and out-migrants*

Industry	Puerto Rico	Out-migrants	In-migrants
Agriculture, fishing, and forestry	24.7	17.1	18.9
Commerce	17.7	7.5	7.9
Manufacture	17.1	8.6	9.4
Construction	8.9	1.9	1.4
Professional and semiprofessional	11.1	4.3	5.2
Transportation, communication, and public utilities	7.1	1.8	2.0
Domestic and personal service	6.6	2.2	2.1

It seems clear that in no industrial grouping was there higher proportion than the "share" that industry had in the employed labor force. The only category which comes even close is that of agriculture and it has a slightly larger percentage returning than leaving. However, when absolute numbers are compared, a difference appears which is masked by the proportions.

It is thus seen that in each of the six major industrial groupings, there has been a net loss of workers. An idea of the kinds of workers within the industrial categories who migrated in 1960 may be secured from a similar comparison by occupations, with the net loss and the percentage that loss was of the total reported in the 1960 census:

TABLE IX.—*Occupational groupings of 1960 Puerto Rican employed persons and 1960 in- and out-migrants*

	Out-migrants	In-migrants	Loss	Percentage
Professional and semiprofessional	12,700	10,000	−2,700	6
Owners and managers except farm	12,400	11,000	−1,400	4
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	10,700	5,700	−5,000	6
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	5,200	1,900	−3,300	5
Operatives and kindred workers	15,700	7,600	−8,100	8
Domestic service	1,000	400	−600	3
Other services	5,700	2,300	−3,400	13
Farm laborers	33,400	19,400	−14,000	13
Other laborers	2,600	900	−1,700	5

There may be indications of shortages ahead in these figures. Forecasts for 1975, when compared with the 1960 census data and the above table indicate that there may be pinches in the following fields: Professional and semiprofessional; clerical, sales, and kindred workers; craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers; operatives; and service workers.[37] They may be avoided, of course, in either one of two ways, or a combination of both: increased educational efforts or increased return migration of workers in those occupations. Only the former is subject to any degree of control, however.

Educational

Around a quarter of the out-migrants in 1960–61 had gone to high school (23.5 and 26.2 percent respectively). Those who had gone to college represented 7.3 and 8.6 percent, respectively. From 3 to 4 percent in recent years have done graduate work. The returnees have shown a slightly smaller proportion with some high school education, but considerably higher percentages with college and graduate work.

Ability to read and write shows an interesting pattern. The 1960 census found 83 percent of the population 10 years and older with this ability. The 1960 out-migrants 10 years or older surpassed the total population with 94.7 percent, or a difference of 11.7 points. The in-migrants, however, fell far below, with 55.8 percent able to read and write. It may be that this seeming anomaly is a function of the fact that education had been completed for many of the previous out-migrants when they left and that they had not continued their schooling in the United States. Meanwhile, of course, the level of education in Puerto Rico has risen rapidly.

Ability To Speak English

Differences tending in the expected direction are found, however, in data on ability to speak English. The 1960 census reported that 37.7 percent of the population 10 years or older said they were able to speak English. This compares with previous census findings as follows:

	Percent
1960	37.7
1950	26.1
1940	27.8
1930	19.4
1920	9.9
1910	3.6

The in- and out-migrants 10 years or older in recent years have given the following proportions speaking English:

	Out-migrants	In-migrants
1957	45.1	51.9
1958	47.2	51.4
1959	46.6	53.8
1960	43.4	57.7
1961	50.6	63.1

Those who are leaving speak English to a much greater extent than does the population as a whole (43.4 percent to 37.7 in 1960, but 50.6 percent in 1961). Of course those who return speak English to an even greater extent. This, as we shall find later, raises problems as well as helping increase the bilingual proportion of the population.

H. LATER DATA ON SELECTIVITY

Methodological questions were raised in 1962 about the validity of of the ramp survey. It was decided to suspend the survey and work out another method of studying the characteristics of the out-migrants as well as those returning from a period of residence in the United States. Two surveys were made using an islandwide sample of households; the first during the months of November and December 1962, and January 1963, and the second during April 1964. Questions about the migration of household members were asked of the migrant's family. The results, where comparable, will be given in the same order as the results of the ramp survey reported on pp. 713–717.[38]

Age

Somewhat more than half (54 percent) of the out-migrants during the 12 months previous to the survey and about whom data were collected were between 15 and 24 years of age.

Sex

Fifty-eight percent of the migrants were males; 42 percent females.

Residence

Almost two-thirds of those moving to the United States (62 percent) came from the rural areas of Puerto Rico.

Education

Illiteracy among the migrants showed a drop when compared with previous data, in spite of the increase in the rural population represented. Only 4.2 percent were reported as unable to read and write; the median years of school completed was 7.3 for the migrants 14 years of age or older, compared with 5.8 for Puerto Rico as a whole.

Comparisons between the ramp survey results and those of the household sample indicate no major discrepancies in the areas of age, sex, rural-urban residence or education. There had been a substantial shift toward rural origin since the earliest reports, however, as was previously noted. This might well reflect itself in more differences in education, occupations and ability to speak English, but the data necessary for judgment on these questions are not available.

I. SOME PROBLEMS OF MIGRATION MEASUREMENT

The ramp survey was instituted to overcome some of the problems arising from the use of the net migration figures alone in the measurement of the ebb and flow of the migratory stream. When movement back and forth was fairly limited, say before 1945, the subtraction of the gross movement one way from the gross movement the other way may not have been too crude as a measure of the annual movement. The total number of persons leaving the island between 1909 and 1945, for example, was 679,772; the number returning was 599,280. The balance was 80,492, or an average of 2,175 per year. The annual average varies with the business cycle in the United States.

The number leaving between 1946 and 1964 (fiscal years) was 8,047,985, or an average of 422,420 per year. These figures include a multitude of tourists, of business men or business trips, and others who flew back and forth several times a year. An enlightening comparison of the gross movement each way and the net is provided by the 5-year period 1960–64. A total of 4,423,408 passengers arrived in the United States from Puerto Rico, but a total of 4,402,173 left the United States for Puerto Rico. The net was 20,235, or 4,049 per year during that period. During 2 years (1961 and 1963) there were greater net flows to Puerto Rico, totaling 1,754 and 5,479, respectively.[39]

The figures are published on a monthly and annual basis. Each monthly figure is not especially significant by itself, since many who came to Puerto Rico during 1 month did not return to the States until the next. Usually, however, they cleared themselves out of the one-way total by the end of the year. However, as the Puerto Rican community in the States grew in numbers and affluence, the attraction of holidays with family and friends grew and resulted in a great increase in Puerto Rican tourism to Puerto Rico. Since the greatest family holiday usually involves both Christmas and Three Kings' Day (Jan. 6), this meant that large numbers would come to the island one calendar year and return the next. This influenced the annual figures on a calendar-year basis to such an extent that they were distorted as a measure of migration. Those who had always advocated fiscal years as a basis of measurement were justified in their criticism of the use of the calendar year. However, starting in 1948, a new factor appeared which has complicated accounting on a fiscal-year basis. The farm labor program, which began to function in an organized fashion in that year, has been responsible for a total of 196,855 workers going to the States under an agreement reached between the employer and the Puerto Rico Department of Labor. The annual number fluctuated between 4,598 in the lowest year to 14,969 in the highest (see table X). There may have been almost twice as many involved in the total farm labor movement in recent years, since many workers "learned the ropes" while coming to the States under the agreement and then came on their own. They usually have returned to the same employer if they have experienced fair treatment at his hands.

The workers have gone to the States in the spring or early summer (in 1 fiscal year) and returned in the late summer or fall (in the next fiscal year). Thus, they also distorted the annual figures when calculated on a fiscal-year basis. This distortion still exists in the published figures. An increase in summer tourism has functioned in much the same manner.

J. THE TWO MIGRATIONS

The Puerto Rican migration is best seen as consisting of two major but interrelated streams. One flows up in the spring and back in the fall. Its main component are the seasonal farmworkers under the auspices of the program just mentioned. (Occasionally, another group goes north as part of an organized program, e.g., railroad maintenance-of-way workers, steelworkers, etc., but this is not a regular movement.)

Table X.—*Number of agricultural workers referred to U.S. mainland—1948–64*

1948	4,906	1957	13,214
1949	4,598	1958	13,067
1950	7,602	1959	10,012
1951	11,747	1960	12,986
1952	12,277	1961	13,765
1953	14,930	1962	13,526
1954	10,637	1963	13,116
1955	10,876	1964	14,628
1956	14,969		

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Department of Labor.

The largest numbers are those who go because of the messages sent by way of the family intelligence service, already described. However, it is obvious that this is secondary migration. Somebody must have gotten there first before messages could be transmitted back.

K. WHO GOES FIRST?

One of the many unsolved questions about voluntary migrations in general and this one in particular is "Who goes first?". We know the answers only in some cases. The Puerto Rican community in Hawaii, as has been stated above, is based on recruitment by the cane growers there. The San Francisco community, the second largest in the Nation until 1950, also grew out of the Hawaiian recruitment. The Puerto Rican-born population of the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area alone was given as 4,068 in the 1960 census. This probably means a total of about 6,500 if the proportion between first and second generation, found in Los Angeles, applies in the San Francisco Bay area.

Scattered groups in the Southwestern States largely are due to a spectacularly unsuccessful recruitment of about 1,200 persons in 1926 to cultivate and pick cotton in Arizona.[40]

Sizable communities in Lorain, Ohio, and Gary, Ind., arose out of recruitment in Puerto Rico and the filling of job orders by the Puerto Rico Employment Service. Other communities grew around placements by the Migration Division from unemployed workers in nearby cities: e.g., Cleveland and Youngstown, Ohio, and Milwaukee, Wis. Still others have arisen in connection with the seasonal farm labor stream. The experience of Buffalo illustrates the mechanism.

The summers of 1951 and 1952 were periods of labor shortages in Buffalo. A farm labor camp only 30 miles away became a recruiting area for the industrial employers. To use the terms the farmers used, Buffalo sent out "pirates" to "steal" their workers. Something similar happened in eastern Pennsylvania, in industrial areas such as Allentown, Bethlehem, and Reading, and in southern New Jersey towns and cities.

The shift in the rural-urban proportions of the net migration to the United States is undoubtedly connected with the farm labor program. The proportion of workers returning to Puerto Rico in the fall varies with the fluctuations of labor demand in urban areas near farms on which Puerto Rican workers are used during the growing and harvesting season. And of course once workers from rural areas in Puerto Rico are settled at year-round work, the family intelligence network operates to bring other family members and neighbors if jobs become available.

Another unsolved question of the Puerto Rican migration, especially that of the earlier days, is the mechanism through which Puerto Ricans reached 39 States by 1910, 45 by 1920, and all 48 by 1930. To this might well be added the question of how Puerto Rican-born persons became residents of all but one of the 101 standard metropolitan statistical areas of over 250,000 population in the United States. Duluth-Superior is the only one in which Puerto Ricans were not found by the 1960 census.[41] Thirty-seven of the 101 had 500 or more Puerto Ricans. They were:

Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton	1,039	New Haven	962
Baltimore	924	New Orleans	718
Boston	1,249	New York City	429,710
Bridgeport	4,371	Paterson-Clifton-Passaic	6,641
Buffalo	2,032	Philadelphia-Camden	15,735
Chicago	25,416	Reading	508
Cleveland	3,124	Rochester	1,493
Detroit	1,254	San Antonio	757
El Paso	665	San Diego	648
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood	811	San Francisco-Oakland	4,068
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago	4,221	San Jose	955
Hartford	2,360	Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke	875
Honolulu	930	Tacoma	811
Jersey City	10,784	Tampa-St. Petersburg	1,008
Lancaster, Pa	541	Trenton	1,559
Los Angeles-Long Beach	7,214	Washington-Maryland-Virginia	2,427
Miami	8,687	Wilmington	586
Milwaukee	2,223	Youngstown-Warren	1,820
Newark	8,958		

We still do not know the answer to the question, "Who goes first and how?" in many localities.

IV. RETURN MIGRATION TO PUERTO RICO

A. WHO RETURNS—AND WHY?

Next we come to an even more difficult question. We know that all voluntary migrations consist of streams running each way. We saw that this was true of immigration to the United States. One of the earliest attempts to arrive at "laws of migration" led E. G. Ravenstein to state in 1885 that, "(1) The net migration in any direction is but a fraction of the gross migration in the same direction, and (2) each main migratory current has associated with it a compensating countercurrent."[42]

The word "compensating" should probably be left out of the discussion, since it seems to imply some mechanical or organic correction between the two streams, or even that there should be a rough balance between the two currents. However, there is a mass of data indicating the accuracy of the general statement.

Dorothy Thomas found the relation between the gross and net movements to range from a net gain of 1 out of 4 for a receiving Swedish community in 1895 to 1 in 10 in 1933.[43]

The "efficiency of migration" is a term coined by demographers to denote "the ratio of the net migration to the turnover," which is defined as the sum of in- and out-migrations.[44] Two periods, 1935–40 and 1949–50, show interesting contrasts for interstate migration. The efficiency index, i.e., "the percentage that net migration for an area forms of the sum of its in-migration and out-migration" was 21.0 for 1935–40 and 1.8 for 1949–50.

In other words, in the former period 1 of about each 5 of the total persons migrating stayed put, at least until the census taker came around. In the latter period it took a movement of slightly over 12 persons to leave a residue of 1.

A few other sets of data on internal migration in the United States help us round out the relationship between gross and net migration. One of the earliest studies of rural-urban migration found that a net migration of 6,296,000 persons from farms during the 1920–30 decade was the result of 13,140,000 moves to farms and 19,436,000 moves from farms.[45] Thus there was a total of at least 32,576,000 moves, or, to use Shryock's method of summary statement, an "efficiency index" of 19.3. The 1930–34 period showed a drop to a net movement from farms of 600,000 persons, which might have been expected from our knowledge of the relationship between cityward migration and demand for labor in urban areas. However—

> approximately eight times as many persons actually moved to achieve this result, reflecting the constant interchange of farm and nonfarm population.[46]

Norristown, Pa., in one of the few long-term studies of in- and out-migration to a specific city, was found to have received over 32,000 persons in the 1910–50 period, or 10 times the net gain due to migration.[47]

Motivation can be ascertained either by noting what people do, or they can be asked why they do what they do. Some of each kind of evidence is available to answer our question as to why migrants return. N. L. Sims, a rural sociologist, discovered from census data that by 1900 there was some return flow from the farms of the Great Plains States to the East. He found that prices had become so high in the Midwest even for poor land that farmers began to return to abandoned land in New England.[48]

Tennessee, it has been noted, has been an area of net out-migration for almost a century. A report for the legislature supplies valuable evidence in answer to the question, "Why do migrants return?". It points out that:

> With the exception of the depression decade, 1930–40, one hundred thousand more persons have left the State than have come into it in every decade between 1900 and 1950 * * * When a cyclical downturn strikes such areas, many of these out-migrants return to their former homes in Tennessee where they inflate the State totals of unemployment.
>
> This is shown by the changes in the number of interstate claimants who file for unemployment compensation in Tennessee against former employers in other States. For example, in 1957 during the first 9 months of the year, such persons numbered about 3,000 on the average. In March 1958, there were over 11,000 in this group out of a total of 66,000 insured unemployed.[49]

Sixty-nine workers who had migrated from and returned to the Upper Monongahela Valley of West Virginia gave their reasons for returning as follows:[50]

Work gave out	36
Needed at home	5
Sickness	4
Did not like it away	8
Miscellaneous	16

Thus the return was directly related to collapse of the job opportunity, which presumably led to the migration, in 50.7 percent of the cases.

An early study of Puerto Ricans who returned from jobs on the mainland showed family reasons in first place. Forty-five percent of all who returned to Puerto Rico after a term of work for which they had been recruited by the War Manpower Commission gave "death (or illness) in the family," or simply "I wanted to see my family" as their reason. Second, with 23 percent, was "contract expired"; illness, with only 7 percent, ran a poor third.[51]

Almost half of the 3,000 men recruited (47 percent) had not returned to Puerto Rico, however, and most of those who had returned (81 percent) said that they would go back to the United States if they were offered a permanent job. Forty-five percent said they would go back even if offered only another temporary job.

Two years later the Columbia University study of Puerto Ricans in New York City found that about 8 percent of the sample of migrants interviewed who had been adults when they left Puerto Rico had been trial migrants: i.e., they had previously lived and worked in New York City, had returned to the island and then come back to New York again to stay. The return migration most often was for family reasons.[52]

Sophisticated persons seem often inclined to scoff at such old-fashioned ideas as acute nostalgia for former scenes and former friends. The West Virginia returnees included about 11 percent who "did not like it away". We do not know how the proportion would compare with that among other migrants, but there probably is always at least a small percentage who return for this reason.[53]

Retirement is increasingly given as a reason for returning when New Yorkers born in Puerto Rico are discussing their plans. The Ponce de Leon Federal Savings & Loan Association of the Bronx, for example, does a substantial business in the sale of homes in Puerto Rico for those who are retiring or are preparing for retirement, according to one of its officers.

There is, of course, the fact that Operation Bootstrap had succeeded in establishing some 917 new factories which were operating in June 1964. These, and other facets of economic development, have made life in Puerto Rico considerably more attractive from an economic point of view. Jobs in industry and services are now available in many areas formerly relatively untouched by modern technology.

Employment in manufacturing rose from 55,000 in 1950 to 106,000 in 1964. Unemployment dropped from 88,000 to 80,000 in the same period, or from 12.8 percent to 10.8 percent of the labor force. This was somewhat over twice the rate of unemployment in the United States, but it was still the lowest rate in Puerto Rico in many years.[54] Two important factors must be considered side-by-side with the proportion unemployed. First, the labor force itself has been expanding rapidly; it rose from 625,000 in 1950 to 734,000 in 1964; thus there are more job opportunities in absolute numbers. Second, the duration of unemployment is somewhat shorter in Puerto Rico than in the United States. Short-time unemployment (less than 5 weeks) accounted for 44 percent of U.S. joblessness but 65 percent of that of Puerto Rico in 1963. Medium-term (5 to 14 weeks) unemployment was almost the same (29.6 percent in the United States to Puerto Rico's 29.4 percent), but long-term (15 weeks and over) came to 26.1 percent in the United States and only 5.8 percent in Puerto Rico.[55] Puerto Rico's unemployment would thus seem to be frictional, in economists' terms; i.e., arising out of moving from one job to another. That of the United States, on the other hand, would seem to be more largely structural, involving basic shifts out of declining industries and areas or replacing of old industry with new sources of employment.

There is still another factor which helps alleviate the rigors of unemployment—family solidarity. Urbanization and other aspects of modernization still have not weakened the Puerto Rican family; "one for all and all for one" still is a reality in a large percentage of families.[56]

In short, an economic environment which could compete with at least some sectors of the continental economy is being created. This may well have encouraged return migration considerably, although it is impossible to quantify this with existing statistics. There are also the questions of preferences for a more equable climate and the opportunity to live near relatives which are influential but difficult to measure.

B. THE EXTENT OF RETURN MIGRATION

It will be recalled that data for the migration from Puerto Rico to the conterminous United States are net figures obtained by balancing the numbers of travelers each way. This means that we do not really know from the Immigration and Naturalization Service reports anything directly about return migration. We do know that there have been a number of years in which the balance of passenger movement was toward Puerto Rico. Before tourism and business travel became important, this probably coincided closely with the migration. Today it may or may not. Some data are available from the 1960 census, some from the two Department of Labor household surveys already mentioned, and some which supplement these two sources, from statistics on the movement of school children and on "interstate" cases registered with the local offices of the Puerto Rico Employment Service. The highlights of these data are summarized below.

Persons 5 years old or over found living in Puerto Rico by the 1960 census who had been living in the United States in 1955 numbered 55,824.[57] Data published by the Census Bureau did not differentiate between those born in Puerto Rico and others, however. Therefore a special tabulation was run for a study conducted by José Hernández Alvarez for the Social Science Research Center of the University of Puerto Rico. It showed 34,040 persons of Puerto Rican birth included in those reporting having resided in the United States in 1955.[58] This figure obviously underestimates the total number of Puerto Ricans ever having maintained residence in the United States. First, unless one denies the identification of Puerto Ricans to those of Puerto Rican parentage, they should be added. There seems to be no sound basis for even a guess as to the number involved but if among the returnees there were the same proportion of first and second generations as prevailed among Puerto Ricans in the United States in 1960, about 44 percent should be added for United States born of Puerto Rican parentage, or some 4,765. Part of these would, of course, be included among those under the age of 5, already mentioned as being excluded in the data given. Second, another unknown factor would have to be added to the 34,000 for those who had lived in the United States and had returned prior to 1955.

An estimate of 107,740 migrants from the United States settling in Puerto Rico between 1955 and 1963 is provided by Miguel Echenique of the Puerto Rico Planning Board.[59] The total includes 82,740 persons of Puerto Rican birth and 25,000 of Puerto Rican parentage. The following fiscal year, 1963–64, showed a total of 39,531, first and second generation. Thus there would be a total of 147,271 between 1955 and 1964. It is obvious that this is a quite conservative estimate of the number of Puerto Ricans who have lived in the United States and have returned to Puerto Rico.

C. TEMPORARY RETURN MIGRANTS

Experience with both Puerto Rican and other migrations indicates that some of those remigrating probably would be testing. The

Columbia University study called them trial migrants.[60] These migrants are attracted to Puerto Rico either by direct job opportunities or hearing about openings and are prepared to stay if everything works out satisfactorily or if not, to return.

There is another ingredient which makes the Puerto Rican returnee quite similar to his continental counterpart who moves back "where he came from" during periods of unemployment. This is interstate payments of claims to unemployment insurance. An unemployment insurance account built up in one State by a worker may be called upon by that worker even if he has moved to another State.[61]

One has only to travel through Kentucky, Tennessee, or West Virginia and count Michigan license plates to obtain a rough indication of unemployment in Detroit, Flint, Pontiac, and other automobile manufacturing areas. Unemployment insurance helps the man who has gone home to work on the land during a temporary plant shutdown, or the worker who moved to another State in search of a job when he sees no hope of reemployment where he has been working. This contributes to the high levels of mobility which are considered by economists to be so vital to the prosperity of the United States.

The extent of interstate payments may be judged by their total in the last 3 months of 1964, $25,708,794, and the first 3 months of 1965, $44,210,510.[62] And a rough idea is given of the importance of out-of-State workers to the economy of States in which payments ran over a million dollars in one of the two periods by the following data.[63]

	October-December 1964	January-March 1965
California	$5,275,419	$8,182,760
New York	4,275,271	7,429,067
Illinois	1,713,710	3,207,435
New Jersey	963,214	1,601,019
Pennsylvania	910,365	1,373,577
Washington	879,773	1,281,565
Massachusetts	859,104	1,368,604
Connecticut	799,940	1,224,563
Texas	770,940	1,122,448

Persons in all 50 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico received payments from other States during the reported 6 months.

It is interesting to note that New York, which outranks California in size of the labor force, is second to that State in amount paid to persons sending claims from outside the State. Data are not at hand to help determine whether this is due to a higher proportion of "outsiders" in the labor force, to size of payments, or to exhaustion of benefits previous to the 6-month period noted. There was only a comparatively small difference in percentage unemployed: New

York, 5.7; California, 6.5 in one period; New York, 5.3; California, 5.5 in the other.

The nine States with the largest interstate payments also have the largest labor force, with two exceptions: Michigan and Ohio. The period of unemployment may have been so extended in these states that individual benefits have been substantially exhausted or they may not have interstate payment agreements with some of the States which are important suppliers of their labor force. The States highest in interstate payments include Washington, which is 6th on the list of out-of-State payments but which is 19th in rank by size of labor force. The explanation for this discrepancy was not immediately available.

Puerto Rico has reciprocal agreements with 35 States of the Union for unemployment insurance payments. Starting in 1957 claimants could register with the Puerto Rico Bureau of Employment Security, which furnished the following figures on registrations per year:[64]

1957	5,350	1961	15,817
1958	8,055	1962	17,615
1959	9,835	1963	19,446
1960	11,915		

Adding these figures would, of course, be misleading. There are many indications that a large proportion of those registering return to work when their slack season is over. For example, the New York City needle trades, a large employer of Puerto Rican workers, is highly seasonal. The returnees do represent individual sources of contact with continental ideas and information on the part of Puerto Ricans who have never migrated. However, they also make a sizable but unquantified contribution to Puerto Rico's balance of payments. But a checking of the figures would undoubtedly show thousands of persons registered every year during the "off season."

D. 1960 CENSUS DATA ON RETURNEES

It will be recalled that 34,040 persons born in Puerto Rico, residing in the United States on April 1, 1955, were found by the 1960 census to have returned to Puerto Rico to reside. Almost 42 percent (41.9, or 14,256) were located in the San Juan Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.[65] The numbers drop drastically for the next four of Puerto Rico's five largest cities:

	Population, 1960	Returnees, 1960
Ponce	145,586	2,168
Mayaguez	83,850	1,352
Caguas	65,098	1,292
Arecibo	69,879	1,084

The "municipio" which received the fewest returnees was Culebra, with 24 returning to a population of 573. Culebra has experienced out-migration for some decades. There were returnees in all 77 municipios.

Hernández found no clearly defined pattern of settlement by groupings of municipios, but when the data were analyzed by rural-urban residence, size of returnee and total populations and levels of family income, there were found to be distinctive patterns in regard to age, sex, income, "lifetime migration," employment, family stability, fertility, education, and ability to speak English. The five major groupings found to give the most significant patterns were: rural farm, rural nonfarm, urban nonmetropolitan, Ponce and Mayagüez, and the San Juan metropolitan area. Within the latter area there was such a wide variation in density of settlement and socioeconomic characteristics that a sevenfold classification of census tracts containing large numbers of returnees was developed. The distribution of returned migrants by ecological and socioeconomic divisions follows:[66]

Division	Returnee population 1960	
	Total	Percentage
Urban fringe, lower class	1,252	8.8
Central city, lower class	2,172	15.2
Central city, upper lower class	2,292	16.1
Central city, middle class	824	5.8
Suburb, middle class	3,430	24.1
Suburb, upper middle class	3,116	21.9
Remainder	1,164	8.2
Total, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area	14,256	100.0

It is seen that the three largest groups in the San Juan area were middle class: 5.8, 24.1, and 21.9 percent, or 51.8 percent of all the returnees, a slight majority.

The returned migrant who has settled in San Juan, when compared with the one settled elsewhere, is more likely to have been born in other municipios, and to be more highly literate and bilingual. He has a considerably higher income, experiences less unemployment, has a record of lower fertility, and, closely related, has a smaller family, both nuclear and extended. The family is more likely to have migrated as a family and to have had both spouses living at home. Within San Juan, the differences between the six classifications mentioned above in regard to literacy in both Spanish and English is extremely interesting:[67]

	Percentage		*Percentage*
Upper middle suburb	87.6	Upper lower central city	77.5
Middle suburb	84.0	Lower central city	63.3
Middle central city	87.8	Lower urban fringe	60.6

A similar distribution is found in regard to unemployment, income, etc.

Hernández points out that Puerto Ricans in the United States are fairly highly mobile and that moving to new areas in the States is one of the alternatives to returning to Puerto Rico. He ties the return migration to the ebb and flow of employment opportunities in the following generalizations:

> As in the return migration of Mexicans during the era of depression, the economically most vulnerable elements of the Puerto Rican community on the mainland appear to seek refuge in the homeland. Migrants who settle in rural areas and the urban slums may be responding to a shrinking of opportunities in the North—opportunities which attracted them fifteen years ago, before automation, before the "leveling up" of occupations and before the influx of other depressed groups into the labor market of the mainland cities. Stated in other words, the migration toward the United States seems to have reached an economic point of saturation.
>
> At all levels, migrants return to Puerto Rico without definite intentions of remaining * * * Paradoxically, visits of this nature may function to solidify residence on the mainland. Except under extraordinary circumstances, economic opportunities in Puerto Rico are scarcely better than those which prevail on the mainland * * * Upon arrival, a visitor may discover that although life has improved considerably in Puerto Rico, it is still not the ideal which he had imagined. He may also be shocked by a sudden feeling of being a stranger.

E. SCHOOL CHILDREN AND MOBILITY

The child who moves from one school to another, even within the same city, is often beset by anxieties. One study found that "the majority of the children approached revealed concerns, worries, fears, or resentment".[68] But children move not only from school to school in the same city; they are an important part of the total migration in the United States. Every big city school system today has to aid children of newcomers from other parts of the country, especially those from rural areas.[69] In the past the question was of aid to children of immigrants.[70]

Data are available for the decade 1953–54 to 1962–63 to show the experience of the New York City schools in pupil movement into and out of the system (see table XI). It is seen that a system with approximately 1 million pupils admitted 363,011 new pupils from other systems in the decade and discharged 419,375 to other systems. Puerto Rico was the source of 104,388 pupils in the 10-year period and 59,924 were discharged to the Puerto Rican school system. The balance was thus 44,464 Puerto Rican pupils added to the New York City schools. It may surprise some, to note that pupils from foreign countries totaled 44,397 in the same period. A big majority of them (27,405) came from other than European countries and most of them probably were from Western Hemisphere countries. The number of non-Puerto Rican, Spanish-speaking pupils has increased considerably in recent years, partly as a result of upheavals in Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

Total pupil mobility is, of course, much greater than the data in table XI show. Intraborough and interborough transfers must be added. This is done in table XII for the 5-year period, 1958–59 to 1962–63.

The figures in table XII contain the results of many thousands of individual and family decisions. Some move as a result of rising on the occupational ladder and thus being able to move to another neigh-

TABLE XI.—*Day schools—Migration balance in the movement of pupil population to and from places outside New York City, school years 1953–54 to 1962–63*

Geographic area	Pupils admitted		Pupils discharged		Migration balance	Ratio of discharges to admissions
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Area adjacent to New York City:						
Nassau-Suffolk	24,286	6.7	114,926	27.4	[1] 90,640	4.7
Westchester-Rockland	7,547	2.1	22,371	5.3	[1] 14,824	3.0
New Jersey	18,609	5.1	45,979	11.0	[1] 27,370	2.5
Subtotal	50,442	12.9	183,276	43.7	[1] 132,834	3.6
Northeast United States [2]	25,926	7.1	36,577	8.7	[1] 10,651	1.4
Atlantic Coast States [3]	61,710	17.0	42,062	10.0	19,648	0.7
Florida	16,940	4.7	27,897	6.7	[1] 10,957	1.6
Other States in United States	36,234	10.0	46,849	11.2	[1] 10,615	1.3
Total, continental United States	191,252	52.7	336,661	80.3	[1] 145,409	1.8
Puerto Rico	104,398	28.8	59,934	14.2	44,464	0.6
Europe	28,031	7.7	10,739	2.6	17,292	0.4
Other countries	39,340	10.8	11,935	2.8	27,405	0.3
Total, outside continental United States	171,769	47.3	82,608	19.7	89,161	0.5
Not stated			116		[1] 116	
Grand total	363,011	100.0	419,375	100.0	[1] 56,364	1.2

[1] An excess of out-migration over in-migration.

[2] Includes New England and New York State except for the counties adjacent to New York City.

[3] Includes Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

Source: 65th Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, Statistical Section. New York: Board of Education, table 32, p. 28.

TABLE XII.—*Mobility of pupil population school years 1958–59 to 1962–63*

School year	Pupils transferred intra-borough	Pupils admitted			Pupils discharged to—		Total	Total pupil movements
		Inter-borough transfer	From outside New York City	Total	Inter-borough transfer	Places outside New York City		
1958–59	53,441	24,484	38,398	62,882	24,484	38,393	62,877	179,200
1959–60	59,666	22,513	34,883	57,396	22,513	42,477	64,990	182,052
1960–61	62,680	25,540	37,432	62,972	25,540	39,864	65,404	191,056
1961–62	66,072	28,206	36,041	64,247	28,206	38,936	67,142	197,461
1962–63	69,843	27,070	39,171	66,241	27,070	42,317	69,387	205,471

Source: 65th Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, Statistical Section, School Year 1962–63. New York: Board of Education. Table 44, p. 37.

borhood.[71] Others are forced to move. Rossi lists evictions, destruction of dwelling (fire, urban renewal, public improvements such as highways), or severe income losses. They represented almost a quarter (23 percent) of the reasons for moving among his respondents.[72] A participant in a workshop on recent migrants to a big midwestern city reported the following in this regard:

> One of the biggest problems is housing * * * We are fleecing them in rent. Families shift around trying to find cheaper rent.[73]

Research indicates that pupil mobility has a deleterious effect on pupil performance. Often the results of mobility are attributed to low socioeconomic status, race, or poor performance by schools. One well-known study showed, for example, that pupils in New York's Central Harlem schools dropped in "intelligence quotient" between third and sixth grades.[74] There is a serious methodological error in the study, however. The same pupils were not tested in both grades. In technical terms, it was a cross-sectional and not a longitudinal study. Why should there be a decrease in IQ? The answer undoubtedly lies at least in part in pupil transiency, which is great in all schools in neighborhoods low on the socioeconomic scale.[75]

Several studies in New York City schools have shown substantial differences between schools marked by low transiency and those characterized by high transiency levels in IQ, reading ability, and personal and social adjustment. The advantages of continuous enrollment in the same school are substantial.[76]

A study of pupil mobility in Chicago concludes as follows:

> Pupils who move frequently between educational environments recurringly confront new situations calling for demanding social adjustments—to new authority figures, to new peers, to new organizational idiosyncracies, etc. These adjustments create demands upon students which are incompatible with those of learning and normal progress. High rates of interschool mobility deprive many pupils, especially those of primary school age, of a secure and stable educational environment; constantly recurring social readjustments inhibit the release of their energies toward creative learning and developmental challenges.[77]

The Puerto Rican pupils in the New York City schools had been shown in 1954 and 1955 to suffer from frequency of moving, but also to improve with years of attendance in the city's schools. The factor of reduced mobility with length of residence was not controlled but indications are that it entered the picture. "Intelligence quotients," in spite of the handicaps working against the child born and schooled in Puerto Rico in taking tests based on a culture other than his own, rose as follows:

72.6 for those here less than 2 grades.
79.9 for those here between 2 and 3.9 grades.
83.2 for those here 4 grades or more.[78]

Light is shed on differences between four groups of fourth- and eighth-grade pupils tested in 1954 and 1955 by the following median IQ scores:

	Fourth grade	Eighth grade
A. Puerto Rican born and schooled	96.3	77.9
B. Puerto Rican born but schooled exclusively on the continent	79.6	86.8
C. Born on continent of Puerto Rican parentage	88.4	94.2
D. Pupils of non-Puerto Rican parentage	96.4	93.7

In short, even by the biased measure of group "intelligence tests," group C had done slightly better by the eighth grade than group D.[79]

F. PUERTO RICAN CHILDREN IN NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS

Children of Puerto Rican birth and of Puerto Rican parentage in New York City's public schools numbered 179,223 on October 31, 1963. The total pupil register was 1,045,554.[80] Their distribution by borough and by school group is shown in table XIII, with comparative figures for children born abroad.

TABLE XIII.—*Puerto Rican and foreign-born pupils, Oct. 31, 1963*

	Total register	Puerto Rican	Foreign born
Borough:			
Manhattan	181,710	57,206	10,098
Bronx	197,322	55,557	7,492
Brooklyn	392,242	60,458	15,560
Queens	240,687	5,060	11,531
Richmond	33,593	942	659
School group:			
Elementary	531,646	116,227	20,002
Junior high	263,177	37,189	9,882
Academic high	204,075	14,727	13,220
Vocational high	40,022	9,147	2,102
Special classes	6,634	1,933	124
Total	1,045,554	179,223	45,339

Source: Facts and figures, 1964-65, p. 37.

Data for May 1947 indicate 24,989 Puerto Rican children in the public schools. Although there was a clustering of 4,853 in 8 schools in East Harlem (in 2 schools they made up 80 and 73 percent, respectively, of the enrollment), the remaining 7,269 in Manhattan were scattered unevenly through 109 of the other 113 schools in that borough.[81]

Brooklyn's 234 public schools enrolled 4,703 Puerto Rican pupils in 165, or 71 percent of its schools. The Bronx had 7,690 Puerto Rican children in 95 of its 116 schools. Queens and Richmond each had a small number: the former with 452 in 102 of its 152 schools, Richmond with 62 in 19 of its 39 public schools.

Thus Puerto Ricans were on the register of 502 of New York City's 666 public schools as early as May 1947. By 1962 there were only 28 elementary schools, out of a total of 588, which had no Puerto Rican pupils. All 127 junior high schools, 57 academic, and 29 vocational high schools had Puerto Ricans enrolled.[82]

Another set of data to supplement those on distribution by borough and school level of the three major ethnic groupings is provided by a similar breakdown of pupils attending high school in 1957 and 1963.

	Academic (percent)		Vocational (percent)		Academic increases (percent)
	1957	1963	1957	1963	
Puerto Ricans	50.6	62.5	49.4	37.5	23.3
Negroes	64.1	74.0	35.9	26.0	15.0
Others	87.5	88.4	12.5	11.6	1.0

If higher aspirations are indicated by choice of academic over vocational high schools, then 23.3 percent more Puerto Ricans displayed them between 1957 and 1963 in comparison with 15.0 percent of the Negroes and less than 1 percent of the others. It should be understood that it is not necessary to go to college to lead a happy and successful life. But the voracious appetite of cybernetics for white-collar jobs indicates that college, which once was looked upon as a luxury, is rapidly becoming a necessity. Virtually the entire Puerto Rican community is organized to convince their children of this fact.

One of the handicaps of most of the Puerto Rican-born children is their unfamiliarity with English, as it was of millions of previous New York City pupils. Two sets of figures, for 1955 and 1963, provide a rough measure of progress. A schoolwide census of English-speaking ability was conducted in New York City in October 1955. It was found that about 50 percent of the 102,500 Puerto Rican children either spoke English "like a native," without an accent, or as fluently as a native but with a slight accent. A third more spoke hesitatingly or haltingly, but well enough for most situations. Seventeen percent either spoke only a few sterotyped phrases or not at all. Fluency had been achieved by 58 percent by 1963–64. This was distributed as follows, by school level:[83]

	Percent
Elementary schools	48
Junior high schools	76
Senior high schools	78

It should be remembered that school turnover among the Puerto Rican pupils is high. Therefore, the pupil population of 1963 may contain only a comparatively small proportion of those in the 1955 population. The Puerto Rican pupil population, in other words, is not a stable entity but one which is constantly losing members, who are replaced by newcomers. The same is true of the adult population, of course. We lack means of measuring this turnover adequately in either case.

Efforts are being made by the New York schools to encourage bilingualism among the Puerto Ricans, in line with the city's tradition of multilingualism.[84]

G. SCHOOL CHILDREN IN THE RETURN MIGRATION

A net outflowing balance from the schools of New York City to those of Puerto Rico was registered for the first time in recent years in 1962–63. Five-hundred-fifty more pupils were recorded as leaving the city's schools to go to Puerto Rican schools than were received.[85] This does not mean, of course, that children had not been transferring from the New York schools to Puerto Rican schools previously; their movement is concealed by the gross figures.

Puerto Rico's own statistics, which include both public and accredited private elementary and secondary schools and movement to and from other areas, are available for the 1952–53 to 1963–64 academic years (see table XIV).

TABLE XIV.—*Pupils transferred to and from mainland school systems, 1952–53—1963–64*

	From Puerto Rico		To Puerto Rico	
	To New York City	To other areas in United States	From New York City	From other areas in United States
1952–53	5,875	473	814	82
1953–54	5,845	400	1,122	132
1954–55	5,141	463	1,284	274
1955–56	6,233	915	1,426	318
1956–57	6,345	879	1,721	344
1957–58	6,176	733	1,870	509
1958–59	6,730	953	2,279	479
1959–60	6,585	1,002	2,503	504
1960–61	5,407	734	2,672	[illegible]
1961–62	4,888	920	3,399	872
1962–63	4,141	1,025	3,513	824
1963–64	5,375	1,323	3,345	1,062

Source: Departamento de Instrucción Pública, Sección de Estadísticas.

It will be noted that there was an increase from 896 in 1952–53 to 4,407 in 1963–64 of those transferred from the United States to Puerto Rico. The 12-year period saw 32,338 children transferred to Puerto Rican schools.

A breakdown by "municipios" for the past few years shows that there is not a single one which has not received pupils from U.S. schools. The highest ranking in order of rank are:

1. **Aquadilla**
2. **Fajardo**
3. **Bayamón**
4. **San Juan**
5. **Cabo Rojo**
6. **Caguas**
7. **Carolina**
8. **Mayagüez**
9. **Manati**
10. **Hatillo**

There is little question about the impact of the returnees on the schools throughout the island, but no studies of it are known. Conversations with teachers and school administrators over the past few years have a most familiar ring to one who lived in New York City in the early postwar years. The children who are moving to Puerto Rico are undergoing the same process which resulted in newspaper headlines about two decades ago in the Nation's metropolis. Inability to speak Spanish is one of the keys to their difficulties; the others are the usual ones already mentioned. Fortunately, there are many more bilingual teachers in the Puerto Rican schools than there were in New York's. And those teachers whose assignment is the teaching of English find that they have assistants among their newly arrived pupils.

The contribution they will make to the debate which is going on over the reconstruction of life in Puerto Rico is still in the future. Undoubtedly they will do their share both economically and culturally, just as millions of migrants have in a multitude of other situations. Probably the only generalizations which could be made today would be based on Oscar Handlin's forecast for the future of New York's newest newcomers:

> There is every reason to be optimistic about the future, if the society of which these people have become a part allows them to act freely and as equals within it.[63]

There does not seem to be any basis for doubt that Puerto Rico will give its returnees the freedom of action and the equality which are so basic a part of democracy as practiced by the Puerto Ricans.

Now we must turn to a subject which is much more "iffy"—the future of Puerto Rican migration.

V. PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION IN THE FUTURE

A. "PUSH-PULL" INADEQUATE

It is well to recall the factors which have been found to be primarily responsible for the ebb and flow of the migration from Puerto Rico to the States. The mechanistic analogy of "push-pull," which has been so widely used in migration studies (including earlier ones by the senior author) has often misled both demographers and the public. It now seems clear that the analogy oversimplifies the process through which the migrant must go in reaching a decision on whether or not to migrate. Even worse, it treats the migrant as if he really does not have a hand in the decision at all. However, it is of the nature of man to make choices. Few of the many empirical studies of areas of out-migration give any support to the idea that the person who migrates could not have chosen to remain in his own area. There are obvious exceptions: Floods, volcanic eruptions, or other natural catastrophes may literally drive people from their homes and make it impossible for them to return. The number of such cases is fortunately relatively small.

Usually we are dealing with decisions which must be made between remaining in one's original locality at a given level of living or migrating to a new locality in the expectation that the level can be raised. The previous discussion of the close direct relationship between the economic cycle and migration indicates the validity of this statement. An illustration from the Puerto Rican experience may be helpful. It has been pointed out that migration from Puerto Rico rose to its highest point in 1953. One has only to compare levels of living on the island in the period 1909–30, when the average annual new out-migration was 1,986, with those of the 1951–60 decade, when the annual average was 41,212, to see that employment opportunities on the mainland are far more decisive than the so-called "push" factor. Death rates, to use one sensitive index to levels of living, always ran around 22 to 24 per 1,000 in the former period, compared with 7 to 10 per 1,000 in the latter.

Analysis of the motivations of the Puerto Rican migrant, made in 1948, found that the subjective feelings of the migrants conform to what would be expected by reasoning from the economic data and the comparison of levels of living as they might influence the flow of migration. It may be recalled that the Columbia University study divided the migrants into "deciders" and "followers". The report comments on the issue under discussion in the following passage:

> The migration of the Puerto Ricans to New York as a whole is to be seen, therefore, as an economic move, particularly among the deciders; their economic frustration on the island is less discernible, subjectively, to them than the rosy promise which they see in New York. New York beckons also to the followers; but they respond not so much to economic opportunity as to the pull exercised by their families already living here. Yet even their motivation has been indirectly economic. They are, after all, responding to the suggestion of some decider in the family, a decider who was most likely to have been economically motivated in making his original decision. Thus the followers are actually responding to someone else's economic motivation rather than their own.
>
> When the deciders declare that they see their move to New York mainly as a response to the city's economic promise, they are, in effect, expressing their decision to search elsewhere for the better jobs, the opportunity, and the wages not accessible to them in Puerto Rico. When the followers explain their emotional

> and financial need to be with their families in New York, they too are expressing, though indirectly, their urge to find elsewhere the security which for them the island cannot provide. Yet, all these groups subjectively experience these impulses not as a deficiency of life on the island, but in terms of the advantages of the metropolis.[67]

Two of the classic studies of Negro migration northward make the same point about that stream. In fact, St. Helena Island, S.C., was chosen for a 1928 study specifically because "Problems of racial friction and lawlessness, often mentioned as important causes of general Negro migration, were absent."[68]

The key to the decision to migrate which must be made by each individual (even most of those labeled "followers" by the Columbia University study) seems to have been well stated by Lively and Taeuber in 1938:

> People do not move primarily because the level of living in the area where they are is low but rather because they have become aware of a different level of living which appears more attractive.[69]

These people cite the fact that often large-scale migration has taken place from farming areas such as the Corn Belt, which are far above the national average in wealth and amenities. However, these areas lie within the zone of influence of metropolitan areas which, through mass media, present a picture of another and more attractive way of life, including greater economic opportunities.

B. THE SENSITIZING PROCESS

Puerto Rico has changed tremendously in the past 20 years, per capita and family income have been climbing, and every other index of economic well-being has risen significantly. Death rates, especially the infant mortality rate, have dropped; the expectancy of life is now about equal to that of the United States. It seems paradoxical to some observers that the greatest out-migration has taken place during this period of unprecedented well-being. An old German saying may help in understanding the situation: "The appetite grows with eating!" Puerto Ricans today are more highly literate and better educated in other respects than ever before. They read more newspapers and magazines, listen more often to the radio, view television more frequently. Antonio Pedreira's "insularismo" has been waning. Even more important, "Operation Bootstrap" and its related broad-scale educational efforts have made a deep impression on those whom Franklin D. Roosevelt called "the common man". Many more now feel that there is hope for them to improve their lot in this world.[70]

It is this sense of hope which is the most powerful ingredient in the worldwide "revolution of rising expectations." The Puerto Ricans have improved their ability to take advantage of better economic opportunities through schooling and experience. The widespread vocational school system has helped enormously. And work in the growing number of manufacturing plants has given them added ability to compete in a job market of some 70 million workers with the highest wages in the world. One constantly hears stories of the best workers leaving new plants in Puerto Rico for better paying jobs in the States.

The appetite, then, has been whetted by education, both formal and informal, plus experience. The sensitizing process which is essential to migration, has been under way for several decades. It is this process about which we should speak, instead of using the oversimplified, mechanistic, analogy of "push."

C. THE MAGNET

Aspirations, one of the products of increasing dynamism in a society, are likely to rise faster than the society's ability to fulfill them. Or to return to our German adage, the appetite may grow faster than the person's ability to feed that appetite. New methods of securing sustenance are sought. The mainland labor market has for years appealed to some persons as supplying increased sustenance, as we have seen. But the possibilities were fairly limited until after the immigration restriction acts of the 1920's. They were again limited by the "Great Depression," during which unemployment soared to a horrifying 24.9 percent of the labor force,[21] and later by the transportation difficulties of World War II.

Labor shortages were so severe during and immediately following the war, however, that active efforts were made by continental employers to recruit workers in Puerto Rico. The placements, plus the "family intelligence network," plus increasing job opportunities, resulted in the dramatic rise in the net migration already reported.

The severe labor shortages reflected two phenomena: one short range; one long range. The first was the presence of around 3 million persons in the Armed Forces during a period of high employment. As the Nation began to feel the economically depressing effects of demobilization, the Korean war arrived to counterbalance them.

The long-range factor concerns us more here. It will be recalled that the depression decade brought about a drastic drop in the U.S. birth rate. A net reproduction rate of 984 was registered for the 1930–35 period and a further drop to 978 was recorded for the next half-decade, 1936–40. It was not until 1940 that the line of 1,000, necessary to the reproduction of a population, was crossed and a rate of 1,027 was reached. In terms of crude birth rates, there was a drop from around 23 to 25 per 1,000 in the 1920's to 16.9 in 1935, and a slight rise to 17.9 in 1940 and 19.5 in 1945. The midfifties saw a return to rates around 25 per 1,000. The lower birth rates of the depression years were reflected in the drop in the number of persons in the productive-age categories, available for the labor force some 18 to 20 years later, i.e., from about 1948 to 1950. By the same process, the increase in births late in the 1940's is now beginning to reflect itself in an increase in the number of persons available for the labor force. That this trend will continue upward is indicated by a glance at the following birth and net reproduction rates for recent years:[93]

	Birthrate per 1,000 population	Net reproduction rates
1940	19.4	1,027
1945	20.4	1,132
1950	24.1	1,435
1955	25.0	1,676
1960	23.7	1,715
1961	23.3	1,704
1962	22.4	1,633
1963	21.6	1,564

D. THE PULL WEAKENS

We have seen that recent years have witnessed a substantial decrease in the net out-migration from Puerto Rico. This obviously arises from a reduction in job opportunities in the States for persons with the types of education and training possessed by most Puerto Ricans. To a considerable extent this reflects a "normalization" of the two unusual factors mentioned above. There is another factor, perhaps even more important: there has been a considerable increase in education and experience requirements for getting and holding a job in the States in recent years.

Long has made an analysis of unemployment rates by characteristics of the workers for 1949–50 as:

> When the unemployment rate averaged 5.6 per cent (and the labor force participation rate 58.2 per cent), and 1959–60, when the average unemployment rate was also 5.6 per cent (and the labor force participation rate 58.3 per cent).[94]

Unemployment rates rose for manual, unskilled and domestic service occupations, and for poorly-educated workers. They fell for professional, skilled, clerical, sales, and nondomestic service occupations and for better-educated workers. "The occupational composition of employment altered drastically", according to Long's analysis. Total employment in the manual, unskilled and domestic service occupations "fell" by over a million, but the total in the professional, white-collar, skilled, sales, service, and clerical occupations "rose" by 8½ million.

Unfortunately, most of the migrants from Puerto Rico fall among the "poorly educated" and into those occupations in which jobs are decreasing and unemployment is increasing. This statement, at first glance, does not seem to be consistent with what has previously been said about selectivity. However, it must be recalled that while the migrant is above the average in various respects when compared with his fellows in Puerto Rico, he is not being compared with them in his new environment. He is being compared with workers who grew up in an industrialized environment; for whom problems of "industrial discipline", so knotty in the early days of Fomento, had been solved during their adolescence. He is being expected to fit into an economic complex much larger and much more highly differentiated than the one from which he moved. Generally, one step on the skill ladder was lost in the move, at least temporarily, according to the Columbia University Study.[94]

The same phenomenon was found in the United Kingdom when West Indians migrated there under circumstances closely paralleling those of the Puerto Rican migration.[95]

E. HOW MANY MIGRANTS IN THE FUTURE?

It has been seen that the unusual circumstances which helped bring about the fairly high out-migration rates of the late forties and the fifties had begun to lose their efficacy toward the close of the latter decade. Two additional factors have begun to make their influence felt: Increased educational requirements and increased competition from the "homegrown" labor force as a result of the maturing of the products of the "baby boom".

The result has been an almost uninterrupted annual decline in the net out-migration. This probably was slightly exaggerated in recent years by an increase in Cuban immigration to Puerto Rico by way of the mainland.

The increase in Cuban citizens living in Puerto Rico during the past few years has not been as great as has sometimes been reported, so far as can be determined by official figures. Cubans have reported during the past six annual registrations of aliens as follows:[96]

1959	523	1962	2,963
1960	537	1963	4,377
1961	2,527	1964	6,128

The increase from 1960 to 1964 was thus 5,601. It has been said that the Cuban immigration has accounted for the data showing net migration back to Puerto Rico. Let us examine this assertion. The net migration to Puerto Rico in 1961 was 1,754. The increase in Cubans registered in Puerto Rico during the year 1961 was 1,990. Thus, there might have been a net outflow from Puerto Rico during 1961—of 236 persons. The year 1963 showed a net return flow—5,479 persons. Cuban increase during 1963 was 1,414, according to alien registration. This would have still indicated a net inflow to Puerto Rico—4,065 of non-Cubans.

Given the comparatively small number of Cubans, the nature of migration statistics, and the changing employment situation in both the United States and Puerto Rico, it does not seem that the Cubans have played a highly significant role in the migration balance.

There has also been some immigration in the past few years from the Dominican Republic which has suffered from political upheavals. Data to quantify it is not at hand. There were 1,796 persons born in the Dominican Republic according to the 1960 census which also found 1,092 Cuban-born.[97]

It would be a mistake to try to project the adjusted migration of the past few years as the probable future migration. There are too many unknown variables. A full-scale mobilization for war would again take several million men out of the labor force, employment opportunities probably would increase and out-migration from Puerto Rico would also increase. On the other hand, if "peaceb reaks out", there may well be a decrease in employment and a further increase in unemployment. The dangers of reliance on an inflated projection of migration trends based on a few peak years have been pointed out by Roy G. Francis, in "The Predictive Process," already cited.

VI. Puerto Rico's Economy and Future Migration

A. POPULATION AND LABOR FORCE TRENDS

It may well be helpful in thinking about Puerto Rico's future population trends to study careful population projections on two sets of assumptions worked out by three of Puerto Rico's most highly trained and competent demographers. One utilizes an estimate of 15,000 per year net out-migration for 1960–65, which we have seen is high. They are somewhat higher in estimating the annual loss for 1965–75: 20,000.[98] On this basis, and assuming that recent trends in natural increase do not shift substantially by 1975, a population of 3,218,000 is foreseen for that year, or an increase in total population of 868,000.

Even more important than the figure for the total population, however, is the estimate of the size of the labor force, which would be 915,000, assuming no significant change in the labor force proportion of the migration or in labor force participation rates. This would represent an increase of 287,000 in the 15 years, 1960–75.

They have also made another set of assumptions which should be considered carefully. If there were to be no net out-migration during the 1960–75 period, and no change in the birth and death rates, the population of Puerto Rico would rise by 1,246,000 to a total of 3,596,000. The labor force would increase by 431,000, to 1,059,000.

It is at this point that great care needs to be taken to differentiate between either sentimental or political sloganeering on one hand and solid planning for the future on the other. One cannot disagree with those who frequently respond to the challenge of overpopulation with the pat phrase "People are our greatest resource". Of course the statement is true, but it must be qualified to make it meaningful. One might also say truly, "Water is an indispensable natural resource." Those who live on semidesert land which would produce bountifully if it could receive 50 inches of adequately timed rainfall a year would agree enthusiastically. But if they were to receive from 200 to 250 inches of rain a year they would fervently wish for less generous portions.

People are an invaluable, an obviously indispensable, natural resource, but that is only the beginning of thinking about the relation between economic development and population problems, not the end. There are other vital elements in the process of production of goods and services to meet peoples' needs, land, and capital goods being the most obvious. There is also the less obvious but equally important necessity to have people prepared for a productive life by being healthy in mind and body and educated for their economic roles as both producers and consumers, as well as for their political and social roles as citizens of that most difficult form of polity—democracy.

We have seen above that increasing amounts of education and training are required to obtain and hold a job in the complex economy of the United States. The same increasing requirements are now being found in Puerto Rico. Here attention will be directed to the rising cost of putting a man to work in the increasingly complex economy of Puerto Rico. When the Government of Puerto Rico started its industralization program during World War II, the capital cost of its first five plants was about $11 million. They employed 992 workers, which makes a per capita investment of approximately $11,111 per worker. Today, the investment per worker is well over $25,000. It is generally figured that one job outside the Fomento program is created for each job in it. But someone must make a capital investment for that job to be created.

Step-by-step with increased capital cost per worker employed, of course, goes greater productivity per worker. Area after area throughout the world finds it difficult to keep up with rapid population growth because it is possible to produce more and more with relatively fewer workers. A study of this phenomenon in two industrializing areas, Puerto Rico and Mexico, has led to the following sobering conclusions:

> As labor utilization improves, national income grows. The workers in a new textile factory produce far more cloth than the one using a hand loom. A motor truck transports more goods and transports them more quickly than an animal-drawn vehicle. And so it goes—virtually every new element introduced as part of the process of economic growth leads to higher labor productivity. This means that there can be substantial increases in national income without any change in the overall level of employment. In fact, national income can double or treble without an increase in the volume of total employment, because the rate of increase in national income is closely related to the rate of increase in labor productivity, while the rate of increase in total employment depends primarily on the size of the labor reservoir.[99]

Let us look at the prospects for employment in 1975 in the light of the fantastically successful record of "Fomento" in getting factories established in Puerto Rico in the past 15 years or so. Its work has deservedly attracted the attention of the world. It has been carried ahead with imagination, initiative, and ability which find few, if any, parallels in history. It had succeeded in securing the establishment of 917 manufacturing plants operating on June 30, 1964. Direct employment was being furnished 64,255 workers.[100] The average employment per plant is thus around 70. The average is misleading, however, since the newer plants hire fewer workers than the older plants, which is consistent with the generalization made above. The average number of workers per plant in the 125 establishments which started operations in the 1961–62 fiscal year was only 44.[101] It will be recalled that the first 5 plants in the industrialization program averaged 238 workers.

The direct and indirect results of the Fomento program and related private investment projects thus have furnished some 128,000 new jobs, in round numbers, during the past some 20 years.[102] Let us compare that figure with the projection of Janer and his colleagues of an increase in the labor force of somewhere between 287,000 and 431,000 between 1960 and 1975. It is obvious that even with an out-migration of some 15,000 per year, the labor force will increase by more than twice the increase in the number of jobs created by 1960; in fact, 224 percent. If no net out-migration takes place, the increase in labor force would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 359 percent.

These are somber facts. How do they compare with Fomento's own assessment of what it will accomplish by 1975? In judging this we have the estimate made by J. Díaz Hernández, director of continental operations of the Economic Development Administration, in July 1962, "2,000 plants by 1975."[103] He believes there is a well-founded hope that 2,000 plants will be in operation by 1975. Let us assume that they will all be of the modern type such as those established during the 1961–62 fiscal year, and thus will employ an average of around 44 workers. Direct and indirect employment would thus rise to 176,000, but the labor force would be somewhere between 915,000 and 1,059,000, depending on our estimate of out-migration. If employment per plant were at the present long-run average of about 70, the number of jobs created, directly and indirectly, would be 292,000, added to the 1960 total of 543,000 jobs, or 835,000 places for a labor force of 915,000 to 1,059,000. At best, there would still be an unemployment rate of 9.1 percent.

Even the exceptional record achieved by Fomento since the 1940's will not be adequate to create the number of new jobs which will be required by the population increase. And, it should be noted, "birth control" or "family planning" is not directly relevant in reducing the 1975 labor force, no matter how vital it may be for the long run. The potential members of the labor force in 1975 have already been born. It is relevant, however, in that the already high dependency ratio in Puerto Rico may increase and thus further burden the productively employed sector of the population. The 1960 dependency ratio (those 15 to 64 years of age to all others) in Puerto Rico was 3.3 to 1, or nearly double that of the United States, 1.7 to 1. Thus a potentially gainfullly employed person must support 3.3 others in Puerto Rico but only 1.7 others in the United States. (This type of difference is found throughout the world between high fertility countries and those in which fertility has been brought under control.)

B. UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT TRENDS YESTERDAY AND TODAY

There is another factor which must be added to the picture thus far sketched: Unemployment. The proportion of the labor force without work had been reduced substantially since 1940: From 15 percent (90,000) in that year to 10.8 percent (80,000) 24 years later. Thus far (with the latest data available, those for the first 7 months of the 1965–66 fiscal year), unemployment rates show a tendency to rise. This period showed a monthly average of 97,000 seeking work compared with 89,000 for the first 7 months of 1964–65. However, since the labor force also increased, the unemployment rate rose only from 11.6 percent to 12.2 percent.

An even less auspicious tendency has been an increase in underemployment—defined as a workweek of less than 35 hours. Underemployment accounted for 20 percent of all employment in 1953–54. It dropped to 17 percent in the 1957–61 period.[104] The 1963–64 fiscal year showed a climb to an average monthly rate of 26.3 percent.[105] Thus each month from 150,000 to 232,000 of Puerto Rico's labor force were working less than 35 hours a week in that year. The first 9 months of the 1964–65 fiscal year showed a rate of 29.2 percent, which may or may not have dropped during the next quarter.[106]

It thus seems clear that the economy must cope with three major factors if extremely serious unemployment is to be avoided:

First: Present-day unemployment and underemployment is high.

Second: Unemployment is increasing slightly and underemployment substantially, probably partly because of the recent reduction in net out-migration;

Third: The rate of natural increase is still one of the highest in the world and even if a net out-migration of 15,000 annually could be achieved, has already produced a potential labor force increase of at least 287,000 workers by 1975. And as has been pointed out, this is more than two-and-a-third times the increase in jobs which has been achieved during the entire brilliant history of "Operation Bootstrap".

C. UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE FAMILY STRUCTURE

An unemployment rate of around 5 percent of the labor force, which the United States has approximated in the past few years, has alarmed all but the Nation's most conservative forces. The labor movement and liberal and progressive public officials have been demanding special public works projects, changes in fiscal policy, retraining programs for areas of chronic unemployment, etc. Puerto Rico's rate is now more than double that of the mainland in 1964. It comes close to being as high as that of the United States during 1940 (14.6 percent), the last year of the Great Depression. Comparisons with seven industrialized foreign countries indicate how far both Puerto Rico and the United States have to advance in improving their unemployment rates. The rates in 1964 were: Puerto Rico, 10.8; United States, 5.2; Canada, 4.7; Italy, 2.9; France, 2.15; Great Britain, 2.5; Sweden, 1.6; Japan, 1.0; Germany (Federal Republic), 0.4.[107]

There is, however, a great difference between a high unemployment rate in an almost completely urbanized society such as the United States and one which still has about 40 percent of its people living in rural areas. Social and geographical factors are involved. The Puerto Rican family is less likely to have been disrupted by urbanization, and therefore more likely to give a helping hand to unemployed members. And it includes the "compadrazgo" which widens the circles of help far beyond the limits of the nuclear family more characteristic of urban life. Obviously, families still living on the land can be more helpful, at least in regard to food supplies, than can those living in an urban apartment house. Even a country shack is more flexible in regard to occupancy than many city dwelling units.

These factors may well account for a fair amount of resilience in Puerto Rican labor force. Its behavior since 1940 is indicated by the following statistics:[108]

Year	Labor force (in 1000's)	Participation rate (percent)	Unemployment rate (percent)
1940	602	52.2	15.0
1948	638	51.9	7.6
1950	686	53.3	12.9
1952	679	52.5	15.9
1956	641	49.3	12.9
1960	625	45.2	13.1
1962	605	45.9	12.8
1964	734	46.5	10.8

Out-migration probably was the main reason for the reduction in participation rates during the 1950's. It was complemented by an increase in school attendance. The return migration probably explains the rise between 1960 and 1964. An examination of changes by age lends credence to this belief. The major increases have occurred in those age categories most characteristic of the returnees.[109]

It would seem to be an error to count on an indefinite continuation of the flexibility seen in recent years. It is characteristic of a predominantly rural, "folk", culture and Puerto Rico is moving rapidly away from such a culture.

D. HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Neglect of some of the factors just treated might be referred to as the fallacy of overoptimism. There is an opposite fallacy of overpessimism which often has arisen when persons confront a situation or a prospect of extremely high unemployment. It arises out of neglect of the fact that job openings do occur in times of high unemployment, in fact even during depressions. The chances of securing a job are reduced for job seekers as a whole, but there are ways of improving the chances. Education, and often specific job training, is the most important method of improving one's chances of employment. This is made clear by every study of the influence of education on employability. The experience of the past decade, cited by Long, above, is a dramatic illustration in regard to the economy of the United States.

A recent report states that "'Among the unemployed in 1959, the unemployment rate for college graduates was about 1½ percent; for those with some college education, about 2½ percent; for high school graduates, about 4½ percent; for those with less than a high school diploma, about 8½ percent, and for those with only a grade school education, about 12 percent.[110]

Many signs point in the same direction for Puerto Rico. The report of the chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico to the Seventh Pan American Conference of Engineering Societies in August 1962, provides a good example.[111] The University of Puerto Rico during the period 1942–62 graduated some 40,000 students. The number increased from 747 in 1942 to 3,477 in 1962. The number being graduated by all Puerto Rican universities during this time rose from about 900 to 5,000 per year. These graduates have all been absorbed into the economy, either in Puerto Rico itself or on the mainland.

Another report indicates that industrial technicians are not being produced fast enough in Puerto Rico to fill either existing needs or those projected for the future. Present needs among 226 firms surveyed early in 1962 were for 198 technicians, with 461 more estimated as needed by 1964.[112] The Puerto Rico Employment Service, according to a personal interview with Mrs. Petroamérica Pagán de Colón, its director at that time, has several hundred job openings which it cannot fill because of shortages of persons with specific training and experience.

Projections of future manpower requirements have been made by the planning board, which has constantly stressed the need for an increase in both the general educational level and in the number of persons trained from skilled, technical, and professional employment.[113] There can be no doubt of the consensus on the need for greater stress on education and training for the demands of the Puerto Rican labor market. Without sizably greater investments in education and training, the difficulties of "Operation Bootstrap" during the coming years will be immeasurably increased.

VII. THE BALANCE SHEET OF MIGRATION—A POINT OF VIEW

A. THE DEBITS OF MIGRATION

It has been made obvious that migration is a complex phenomenon. However, at the risk of oversimplification, an attempt will now be made to summarize the debits and then the credits of our balance sheet. This effort is difficult only in part because of the complexity of migration, which is one important consideration. Second, it is difficult because many of the factors which should be spelled out in detail are still largely unstudied or are highly resistent to quantitative treatment. Third, and closely allied with the second, is the highly subjective nature of individual reactions to discussions of migration. The subject is liable to lead to quite volatile reactions. An outstanding example is the peroration to a speech on migration at the conference on the subject organized by the University of Puerto Rico in 1956:

> I would rather see Puerto Ricans die in the jungles of Ecuador than in the asphalt jungles of New York City!

Migration undoubtedly is strong medicine! Courage is needed to pull up one's roots, sever the ties of neighborhood, of village, even perhaps of family. Granted that the courage is sometimes that of desperation, it must still be present.

"I miss my family", was the number one reason for unhappiness about life on the continent among the War Manpower Commission recruits, and "I miss my friends and relatives" was the top reason given for dissatisfaction by those who had migrated to St. Croix.[114] The fieldworkers in the farm labor program of the migration division of the Puerto Rico Department of Labor year-after-year have reported family reasons as the major factor in noncompletion of work agreements.

The literature of migration includes many moving accounts of the disorganization of family life which has so often accompanied migration.[115]

A good deal has also been written on the deleterious influence on the family of migration to New York City. Two factors must be considered in this connection. The urbanization process itself has a disruptive effect on family life; migration from the country to the city in Puerto Rico itself may well have more or less the same consequences as migration from Puerto Rico to New York City. Second, it is seldom noticed that migration may be one consequence of family disruption. The Columbia study found, for example, the following contrasting proportions of divorced and separated persons among the migrants, as compared with persons residing on the island:

	Men (percent)	Women (percent)
Migrants	4.0	16.0
Islanders	1.4	6.4

No matter how the issue is qualified, however, migration, especially of working class persons, has led to a good deal of personal suffering and family disruption. No one can put a dollar sign on loneliness and heartache; any attempt to quantify this debit item would be doomed to failure.

The drama of the so-called "Puerto Rican problem" put the group in the headline of New York City newspapers in the late 1940's and early 1950's. The newcomer often was treated as if he were the cause of the difficulties of which he was the victim.[116]

Personal difficulties varied, of course, with age, sex, education, previous occupational history and training, color, religion, marital status rural or urban origin, whether accompanied by family, size and age distribution of the family, etc. Probably more influential than any other single factor is ability to understand and speak English. The Columbia University study concluded "that language proficiency is the most important factor" in its index of adaptation.[117] Sixty-five percent of all Puerto Ricans interviewed during a study of Lorain, Ohio, in 1954 mentioned language as the source of their greatest difficulty.[118]

Studies in New Haven, Conn.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Jersey City and Perth Amboy, N.J.; Philadelphia, Pa., and New York City varied in their emphasis on the needs of the newcomers.[119] That of the Welfare Council of New York probably is the most inclusive:

> The difficulties of these congested Puerto Rican areas may be listed as: (1) need of houses, (2) need of care for children, (3) need of recreation centers, (4) need of more special teaching and handling of school children, especially of the older ones, recently arrived in the schools with many Puerto Rican students, (5) need of training in occupational skills, (6) need of prenatal care and of health care generally, (7) need of education as consumers in the continental environment, and especially in regard to foods, (8) need of information, in Spanish, as to the rights and responsibilities of citizens and the services available to them in New York, through governmental and voluntary agencies, (9) need to build up local understanding of Spanish culture. Finally, (10), in order to meet the non-English-speaking applicant halfway and understand his needs immediately, agencies need Spanish-speaking personnel.[120]

Many agencies tried to carry out the numerous recommendations of the Welfare Council report. Several years later, the Brooklyn Council for Social Planning surveyed the difficulites of the Puerto Ricans as they reported them, to all the social, civic, religious and welfare agencies of that Borough. The 24 organizatons answering reported the following:

Language.—Listed by 19 agencies in first place, by 3 in second place.

Housing.—Listed by 15 agencies in first place, by 7 in second place.

Health.—Listed by only 6 agencies in first or second place, but 18 agencies listed bad health as a prevalent handicap.

Employment.—Listed by only 1 agency in first place, but 13 agencies found that Puerto Ricans have some difficulty in obtaining employment.

Family relations.—Listed by 4 agencies in first place, 12 agencies mentioned this as a difficulty but gave it slighter weight.

Government relations.—Listed by all agencies as a minor difficulty.

Other difficulties.—Three agencies mentioned financial difficulty and two listed "cultural patterns," without specifying which ones.[121]

Many of the agencies were willing to help, but one of the fundamental factors found by the Columbia University study was that "Even in time of need, the migrant is generally reluctant to approach an institution for help. He is accustomed to depending on his friends or relatives, whether the problem is unemployment, lack of funds or family troubles. Even Puerto Ricans who have been in New York a relatively long time continue to rely most strongly on family and other informal assistance, although some do learn to seek agency help."[122]

The schools, as always with newcomers with families, bore a large share of the responsibility for helping integrate the newcomers. A special study was conducted from 1953 through 1957 of the Puerto Rican children, their relations with the other children and their progress in school. The report is a veritable mine of information and suggestions and has resulted in dozens of curriculum bulletins and interpretive materials.[123]

How were the children adapting? A study of 162 pupils in 1 Manhattan school in the 12 months April 1953 to March 1954 brought the following proportion of ratings:[124]

	Percent
Rapidly adjusting	18
Normally adjusting	62
Poorly adjusting	20

One of the problems encountered by the Puerto Rican is that of the widespread discrimination against persons of dark complexion. A whole book would be required to do justice to the theme. Let us here simply quote the Rev. Father Joseph P. Fitzpatrick of the Fordham University sociology department who has been following Puerto Rican affairs and participating in "human relations" efforts on behalf of better understanding of the newest newcomers for many years. Interviewed by Time he said he saw the Puerto Rican migration as a real boon to New York and the United States. Unlike previous immigrants, the Puerto Ricans bring with them a history of racial tolerance and a tradition of social intermingling that lets them marry people of other skin colors, from Negroes to whites. "I did a study last year of the behavior of Puerto Ricans in six Catholic parishes in New York." Father Fitzpatrick reported:

> I found that 25 percent of all the Puerto Rican marriages involved people of noticeably different shades of color. It is my own hope that they will make explicit the principles of human brotherhood, of universal respect for men and women, that have been implicit in their culture. If they do, they will have brought a priceless contribution to the life of the mainland.[125]

One problem in dealing with attempts to evaluate an ethnic group in its early days in a new community is that "everybody knows" the pathology of the group and, of course, the entire group is characterized by the attributes of its most visible persons, i.e., the ones who have the most difficulty adjusting to the new environment. While a minority of the Puerto Ricans may have had serious troubles, the consensus of the social workers, teachers, ministers, labor leaders and others who have worked closely with the Puerto Ricans in New York City is probably found in the words of a veteran of 50 years of work in the settlement house movement who said she was encouraged by the fact that her Puerto Rican neighbors "are being assimilated into the life of the city faster than any previous group, partly through their own impressive efforts and partly because we're learning better how to help the process." [126]

Next, let us look at some of the debit side so far as Puerto Rico is concerned.

Some years ago the senior author attempted to deal in monetary terms with another debit factor: "The cost of raising a man", who was then relinquished to another economy. Using techniques suggested by Louis J. Dublin and Alfred J. Lotka, an estimate was made of the cost of food, clothing, shelter, light and fuel, household equipment, medical care, personal attention, entertainment, transportation, education and vocational education, gifts and contributions which a working class family might have to meet to raise a male child to the age of 18. This, in the 1925–43 period was calculated at around $2,500 in rural areas and about $3,000 in cities. The social costs appeared to total about $500 more.

Obviously this cost would be much greater today, because of (1) an increase in the social costs; (2) an increase in price levels, and (3) a rise in the standard of living as well as in levels of living. It was pointed out at the time that:

> it must be noted that we are not here dealing with the personal intrinsic value of a man as a husband, father, son or friend but solely with the value which may reasonably be assigned him as a factor in the economic life of the island. Data are lacking with which to make an estimate of possible future earnings, which would be a more efficient method of computing value. We must therefore fall back on "cost of production" as a rough measure of the value of a man. Obviously, if future earnings were capitalized, the figure in most cases would be considerably higher than the present estimate.[127]

It has recently been pointed out that the concept used by Dublin and Lotka is a static one which does not take the demographic situation into account. It is suggested that the concept of marginal value be applied in the process of assessing the money value of a man. This would mean that:

> In a society with underemployment and relative scarcity of consumer's goods, an additional person will exert further pressure on the supply of such goods and possibly increase even their price, if he can afford to pay it; as, at the same time, it will not be possible to take advantage of his labor in view of the prevailing underemployment, he will become a liability rather than an asset to society.[129]

This dynamic concept probably is more meaningful than the Dublin-Lotka approach, although obviously it would be exceedingly difficult to apply. The condition described comes uncomfortably close to being that obtaining in Puerto Rico.

Another item on the debit side undoubtedly is the loss by the Puerto Rican economy of initiative and skills which are qualities of a large proportion of the migrants. One can hear repercussions of this loss in meetings of businessmen, especially those connected with recently organized plants. Again and again one has been told over the past 20 years about the "best mechanic we had" who used a bonus payment to buy his airplane ticket to the States, where he went to work immediately at twice or three times his hourly rate in Puerto Rico. Here again it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to quantify the movement, but there is no doubt of its existence nor of the general need for more and higher level skills as the economy becomes more highly developed.

There is one debit factor which can be demonstrated quantitively: the effect of migration in increasing the dependency ratio, i.e., the proportion of those in the population who are employed to those who are below and above the productive ages. Comparison of Puert Rico in 1950 and 1960 and comparison between Puerto Rico and the United States will both be helpful in understanding this. There were 2.7 dependents per worker in Puerto Rico in 1950; this had increased to 3.3 in 1960, a rise of 22 percent. The 1960 ratio is almost double that of the United States, which was 1.7. This means that a given increase in productivity must be shared in Puerto Rico with 4.3 persons; in the United States with only 2.7 persons.

Furthermore, the age distribution of the dependents makes the Puerto Rican ratio more expensive to its economy than is the dependency ratio of the United States to its economy. The proportions over 65 years of age are approximately equal: 23 percent in Puerto Rico and 25 percent in the United States. The most expensive dependents are children under 15. Puerto Rico has 185 such children for each 100 employed workers, the United States 84. The heavy concentration of migrants in the young adult age categories plus the high birthrate and low death rate combine to bring about this result.

Finally, it has been charged that dependence upon migration as a solution to the problem of overpopulation exposes the Puerto Rican economy to the risk of a wave of return migration when depressions hit the economy of the United States. This has been true historically, as has been seen. It seems clear, however, that length of residence on the continent has reduced the return flow when unemployment rises. First, the unemployed man now has greater possibilities of local support than in any of the pre-1935 days. Second, the knowledge which he can use in judging whether or not to "stick it out" or return to Puerto Rico is more readily available than ever before. Third, the facilities of the United States Employment Service and of the Migration Division of the Puerto Rico Department of Labor enable him to judge whether another labor market in the United States would afford better opportunities than "going home."

How much each adverse factor sketched above will weigh will depend to a considerable extent on personal predilections. Obviously, judgment on the positive factors also will be subject to the same subjective weighing process. It is somewhat easier to quantify some of the credit factors, however.

B. THE BENEFITS OF MIGRATION

Migration usually benefits the migrant economically. Data gathered in the 1948 study indicate the process. The average weekly cash income of those migrants who came to New York City during the post-World War II period from the island's labor force was:[129]

Last job in Puerto Rico, $14.60.
First job in New York, $28.05.

Average earnings for those who came during the war years were:

Last job in Puerto Rico, $14.00.
First job in New York, $31.43.

Earnings of those who came during the 1930's, the depression years, averaged:

Last job in Puerto Rico, $12.00.
First job in New York, $22.62.

Corresponding earnings for those who came in the prosperity years prior to 1929 were:

Last job in Puerto Rico, $13.00.
First job in New York, $19.04.

Regardless of the period in which they came to New York, the migrants consistently earned more money on their first job in New York than they had earned in Puerto Rico. Those who came prior to 1929 got jobs which paid them about 50 percent more than the jobs they had left in Puerto Rico. Those who came during the depression years increased their income 89 percent. Those who came during the war years more than doubled their Puerto Rican earnings on their first job in New York. Those who came in the immediate post-World War II years did not quite double the wages they had earned on their last job on the island. Data with which to compare living costs are lacking, but personal experience indicates that those in Puerto Rico are not far below those of cities on the Mainland.

The distribution of jobs in New York City among Puerto Rican employed males is given as follows by the 1960 census:

	Percent
Semiskilled (operatives)	41.0
Service	19.2
Clerical and sales	11.5
Craftsmen and foremen	10.5
Professional, managerial, technical, and proprietors	5.4
Unskilled	5.4
Miscellaneous	7.0

Women, of course, are highly concentrated in the operatives category (65.3 percent); followed by clerical and sales (15.3 percent); and then by service trades (7 percent). However, there were only 514 Puerto Rican domestic servants in the entire area. On the other end of the scale there were 2,721 Puerto Rican women listed in professional, technical, managerial, and related fields.

Unfortunately, census data for comparisons of 1950 and 1960 occupational figures for New York City are not available. We do have data, however, for the United States as a whole for first and second generation male Puerto Ricans in 1960. They are given in the following table:

Occupational groupings	Puerto Rican born	Puerto Rican parentage
	Percent	*Percent*
Professional, technical, managerial, etc	5.3	12.4
Clerical and sales	9.3	18.4
Craftsmen, foremen, etc	10.1	16.7
Operatives	40.0	26.4
Service (except domestic)	17.7	10.6
Laborers (except farm and mine)	8.3	7.4
Farm and mine laborers	3.1	1.3
Miscellaneous and not reported	6.2	6.8

It will be noted that the first two groups, which make up the "white-collar" occupations, more than doubled as a proportion of those employed between the first and second generations (from 14.6 to 30.8 percent).

The increase in the white-collar occupations was much sharper among the Puerto Rican women than among the men: first generation, 16.4 percent; second, 57.4 percent. This is slightly above the average for all employed women in the United States, 54 percent. There was a drop of about two-thirds in the "operatives" category: from the first generation's 66.3 to 22.6 percent for the second generation. These data, especially those for the needle trades, will sound familiar to all students of our immigration history.

What incomes do the Puerto Ricans get for their work? Here again, we find increases varying in much the same manner as do those of other workers. Income reported in the 1960 census was $2,533 for the United States as a whole, compared with $1,654 reported in the 1950 census. Those who were farmers reported incomes of $1,434; rural nonfarm dwellers received $1,857 and urban dwellers averaged $2,555.

First- and second-generation differences between 1950 and 1960 incomes reported are as follows:

	Puerto Rican born	Puerto Rican parentage
1950	$1,664	$1,526
1960	2,513	2,868

But there is the factor of age to be taken into account. Earnings increase toward "middle age" and then, except in the case of highly educated professionals, tend to decline. But the average age of the Puerto Rican-born persons in the States is 27.9; that of second generation is 5.9. Obviously, if we are to compare first- and second-generation earnings fairly, we must offset the age factor. This we can do by using the same age group. Let us compare the 25–34 category for the United States as a whole and the four States for which the 1960 census furnishes income data:

	1st generation	2d generation
United States	$2,687	$3,519
California	3,183	3,944
Illinois	3,208	4,042
New Jersey	2,782	3,677
New York	2,631	3,466

Another answer to the question, "Are the Puerto Ricans climbing the economic ladder?" is found in the 1960 census data for median family income for New York City's five counties and three "next door" counties:

New York (Manhattan)	$3,459
Kings (Brooklyn)	3,868
Bronx	4,108
Westchester	4,890
Richmond (Staten Island)	5,136
Suffolk	5,594
Queens	5,756
Nassau	6,665

The median family income in Puerto Rico, as shown by the 1960 census, was $1,082. Since price levels do not vary greatly between New York City and the cities of Puerto Rico for comparable levels of living, the economic advantages are clear.

Consumer goods data from a 1957 marketing survey indicate that in that year 80 percent of the Puerto Rican households in New York City had at least one radio, 79.9 percent owned a TV set, 93.3 percent had an electric refrigerator, and 41.2 percent had their own telephone.[130]

The 1960 census showed 7,396 homes owned by Puerto Ricans in New York City; 18 percent of those in Philadelphia owned their homes.

Of course, "Man does not live by bread alone." There are many indications that life in their new homes is a fruitful, happy one for many thousands of Puerto Rican families. Interviews under many different circumstances and with many different groups indicate that new sights and sounds, new experiences, parks, playgrounds, music, opera, theater—all the advantages of an urban culture—are greatly appreciated. "Maybe I am not going to do so well, but my children will have greater chances for a secure and prosperous future." These words in one form or another are repeated thousands of times. And the children of those who return, having become accustomed to life in a big city, are now freely expressing their loss when they return to Puerto Rico to live. They miss, according to teachers who have discussed the matter with them, "the parks, the playgrounds, the gymnasiums, as well as specific schoolteachers with whom they had become friendly."

It would be easy in attempting to draw up a balance sheet of the migration, to do what prejudiced and bigoted persons in the United States usually do—judge the entire Puerto Rican population in the United States by the small minority which gets into trouble with the formal institutions of the receiving communities. Relief and crime are generally the two areas in which the greatest misunderstandings arise. Report after report has showed that the proportion of Puerto Ricans on relief has varied from around 6 percent to about 11 percent, depending on the business cycle. The past few years have seen the percentage on relief rise to one out of five. Sixty percent of the 20 percent are receiving "supplementary" relief; i.e., they are employed but their income does not suffice to support their family.[131]

Time (June 23, 1958) summarized official information on the New York City situation in the second area as follows: "Puerto Ricans form 8 percent of the population and their share of the crime rate is only slightly more than 8 percent." So far as juvenile delinquency is concerned, a few years ago a broad-scale study of Puerto Rican children in New York City schools found that in two Manhattan school districts which were studied intensively, the court appearances for Puerto Rican children ran 12 per 1,000 pupils compared with 14 per 1,000 for non-Puerto Ricans. Similar studies have showed that in general the Time statement applies to juvenile delinquency as well as adult crime.

Migration is likely to benefit the one who moves to a more complex, more highly productive economy because it enlarges his scope of action, gives him greater opportunities to grasp if he is capable of grasping them. This is obvious in the case of most moves to the United States. There is another factor which plays an important but still largely unanalyzed role in migration. A study in St. Croix found that the Puerto Ricans who had moved to that island were much in demand as more productive workers than the local people.[132] Here there was no question of a more highly developed economy. There was apparently a higher "mobilization" of the energies and abilities of the newcomer since he was facing a crisis in his life and was impelled to put forth greater efforts than his customary and habitual efforts in his former environment. Most people usually operate on a lower level of mobilization of energies than their maximum level, or even of their optimum level, as William James pointed out years ago.[133] In the language of the man on the street, "getting out of an old rut peps you up!"

Closely related to the economic advancement of the Puerto Rican living in the States is the benefit to the entire Puerto Rican economy of their remittances to family and friends. Official figures seriously underestimate the amount of money flowing into the island since they are based on check and money order flows and do not include money sent in bills through the mails or carried in the pockets of those who return, either to visit their old home or to stay. Still, the official figures are most impressive: For the 15-year period 1947–63 such remittances totaled $553,700,000 (see table XV).

Two other sources of income arising out of the migration now contribute sizable sums to the Puerto Rican national income: Social

TABLE XV.—*Personal remittances to Puerto Rico, 1947–63*

[In millions of dollars]

1947	8.3	1956	33.5
1948	9.2	1957	38.4
1949	12.9	1958	34.7
1950	12.6	1959	40.3
1951	17.0	1960	50.7
1952	21.5	1961	59.3
1953	27.9	1962	61.0
1954	29.3	1963	66.0
1955	31.4		

Source: Puerto Rico Planning Board.

security and unemployment insurance payments. It would require a separate study to determine what proportion of the former payments arise out of accounts built up only in Puerto Rico and what arose out of economic activities on the continent. It should be noted that social security payments in Puerto Rico increased from $7.4 million in 1950 to $69.1 million in 1961. By 1963, OASI and disability payments totaled $68,485,000 and unemployment insurance payments were $11,755,000.

No estimates were found of the total of unemployment insurance payments in Puerto Rico on accounts built up in the States, but judging by the experience of some of the Southern States to which workers return when recession strikes, it could run into quite a few million dollars annually.

These direct economic benefits obviously might be considered as repayments on the "cost of production of a man" if we wish to use that concept. There are also some important economic benefits which are not quite so direct in their repercussions. Demographic pressures have been seen to be directly reflected in the high rate of unemployment. Let us see what would have been likely to happen if there had been no out-migration between 1950 and 1960. The population in the latter year would have numbered 2,970,000, instead of 2,350,000 or about 620,000 more inhabitants. It would have been necessary to create 310,000 new jobs more than were created during that period. Otherwise the unemployment rate would have soared far past the extreme danger mark, since only about 100,000 new jobs were created in the entire period 1947–61.

The effect on the per capita income of Puerto Rico would have been most depressing. There are few indications of scarcities of workers serious enough to interfere with production. It would, therefore, seem clear that the removal of the migrant in the labor force would not have affected the level of the national income. This means that if the population had grown by 620,000 more persons during the decade than it actually did, there would have been a proportionate reduction in the per capita income, rather than an increase.

The migration not only removed an average of about 47,000 persons per year in the 1950–60 decade; it also reduced the rate of natural increase. Janer's calculations give birth and death rates and rates of natural increase as follows: [134]

	Birth rate	Death rate	Rate of natural increase
1950	40.0	9.9	30.1
1960	33.5	6.7	26.8

Net out-migration caused shifts in the age and sex structure and reduced the number of women with spouses present. Janer estimates that otherwise the birthrate would have declined only to 38.6. This would have meant a rise in the rate of natural increase from 30.1 in 1950 to 31.9 in 1960, instead of a reduction!

The school system is already striving desperately to keep up with the number of children it must teach as a result of the high rate of natural increase. It can readily be seen what a burden it would have had to carry if it had not been for the out-migration of some thousands of children during recent years. New York City alone received a net of 44,464 children from Puerto Rico in the 10 years, 1953–54 to 1962–63. Some indication of the addition we should have to make if we included children born in the States to those who left Puerto Rico to live and work in the States is given by the New York City public school system report that in the 1964–65 school year it was teaching 190,465 children born in Puerto Rico or born of parents who had been born in Puerto Rico.[135]

We might estimate the number of such children in private and parochial schools in New York City and those attending school in the 100-some towns and cities with Puerto Rican communities as at least 90,000. This would give us a total of approximately 280,000 more children who would probably be attending school in Puerto Rico if it had not been for the migration of recent years! This would require an expansion of over one-third in the capacity of the school system of Puerto Rico. Furthermore, at a per-pupil expenditure of $150, it would mean either an increase of $42 million a year in the education budget or a reduction in school services.

Obviously, the same type of calculations could be made for the additional strain on the economy in the fields of health and welfare, in the absence of migration. The point will not be further labored.

One final point must be listed on the credit side of migration. The U.S. economy and society has served as a vast training school for many Puerto Ricans who have gone to work in its factories and shops. Those who have returned to their homeland are in thousands of cases trained in skilled and semiskilled work and experienced in the industrial disciplines so that they make a real contribution to "Operation Bootstrap."

A comparison of the occupational distribution of returnees for 1960–64 and of all employed persons in 1964 indicates how the two populations compare (see table XVI).

That the returned migrant ranks higher than the resident workers is not surprising in view of their more extended education, already noted. Are they being put to work in Puerto Rico? An attempt to

TABLE XVI.—*Occupational distribution of returnees 1960–64 and Puerto Rican employment, 1964: percentages*

Occupational grouping	Returnees 1960–64	Puerto Rican employment
Total workers	100.0	100.0
Professionals, technicians and related workers	9.7	7.6
Farmers and farm administrators	1.4	6.6
Other managers, administrators, and owners	10.6	8.7
Office and sales personnel	22.8	15.6
Craftsmen, foremen, machine operators and related workers	34.7	29.2
Domestic workers	----------	2.6
Other service workers	8.7	9.0
Farmworkers and foremen	8.2	13.8
Laborers, except farm and mine	4.2	6.9
Others	.6	----------

Source: "1964 Informe Económico al Gobernador," op. cit., p. 163.

quantify the answer to this question has been made by the planning board. It compares the increase in employment between 1960 and 1964 and the employment of the inmigrants by job categories. The results are shown in table XVII. It will be seen that the potential of the returnee is being used: 18,900 workers occupy jobs in the white collar fields, of the 37,000 created in the 5 years studied.

TABLE XVII.—*Increase in employment and utilization of returnees, 1960–64*

Occupational groupings	Increase in employment	Employment of returnees
Professional and technical	15,000	4,300
Managers and owners	7,000	4,700
Clerical and sales	15,000	9,900
"White collar" jobs	37,000	18,900
Craftsmen, foremen, and machine operators	50,000	15,600
Farmers, laborers, service workers, domestic, and others	6,000	9,500
"Blue collar" jobs	56,000	25,100

Source: "1964 Informe Económico al Gobernador," op. cit. p. 162.

The less-skilled returnees are not being absorbed so readily: only 44 percent of the new jobs in the bottom two categories were filled by them as compared with 51 percent of the "white collar" jobs thus filled.

Again, on their return, the migrants find by experience that education and training are crucial in Puerto Rico as they are in the United States. Academicians can write articles and books proving that this is so; the less educated worker discovers it for himself at the cost of the shoe leather he wears out "pounding the streets."

C. SUMMARY

The elements of a balance sheet involving human beings are obviously less subject to quantification than are those of business accounting. They are similar in one important respect: double-entry bookkeeping always is present. Each move which means a given move toward the credit side involves a present or potential item on the opposite page. And the credits and debits vary in importance depending on who reads the books and what his interest is in the transaction. It is also important whether the interest is longrun or shortrun; whether it is public spirited or strictly for personal power or profit; whether it is informed or uninformed; whether it arises out of reasoning based on facts or out of deep-seated prejudices.

The authors have attempted in this balance sheet to state those facts which seemed to them to be relevant. But relevance is determined by one's outlook on life, by one's philosophy, if you will. Our philosophy is based on faith in man. We believe that man can, by taking thought, add more than a cubit to his stature as a social being. And, of course, thought must involve action to become socially relevant. We believe that social institutions exist to serve man's goals in life and not vice versa. We believe that the struggle to achieve one's goals helps strengthen the person and that groups which are formed by men to aid them in their struggle perform an indispensable social function in building a stronger culture and an indispensable function for their members in enriching their personalities.

We believe that men living in isolation from the main currents of world thought and world action begin to deteriorate, to vegetate. The major centers of cultural growth have always been those which have been involved in the meeting and mixing of diverse peoples; in the exchanging of ideas; in the debating of new concepts; in the learning of new ways while holding to the verities of the past. Contacts between peoples of differing languages, of differing cultures—especially when they take place on a nonexploitative basis—will enrich all the participants. Knowledge is one of the human values which grows with sharing.

It is one the basis of these beliefs that we conclude that, in general, the migration from Puerto Rico has tended to benefit:

1. the migrant and his family;
2. the area in which he comes to live; and
3. the area from which he migrates.

1. We believe our data indicate that the migrant goes where he believes opportunity exists and that usually he is correct in his belief. If he is wrong, he usually returns or moves on to another area. He moves, specifically in the case of the Puerto Rican, not only to assure a more satisfactory life for himself, but a more rewarding future for his children. Life is no "bed of roses", nor does he expect it to be.

He is used to working hard and wants an opportunity to secure an adequate reward for his work, now and in the future.

2. The area from which a man migrates may well be inconvenienced in many ways, but if it suffers from an excess of workers capable of doing the kind of jobs which need being done, if it cannot quickly furnish sources of employment, and if another area needs men to do such jobs, it is economically and socially sound for them to leave.

3. The area which requires the workers obviously benefits because commodities and services are being produced which would not have been. It is not enough to say that perhaps it would be just as well if those foods and services were not produced. It is the responsibility of the social, political, and economic structures of an area to decide such matters. If an area wants to abolish an industry or a service, such a decision should be made after full and free discussion of all the costs and benefits. But if an industry is allowed to exist, it will need personnel. And if the local population does not produce the manpower needed, the alternative to abolition of the industry is in migration of the needed personnel.

The alternative to freedom of movement, within national boundaries, is to adopt the totalitarian system of internal passports. Central direction of where workers can move and which industries can hire or fire might possibly be more efficient. It is certainly not consonant with our democratic way of life. And it might produce more efficient robots for factory jobs. It might even be less troublesome for areas into which newcomers move. But our goal, in our opinion, is not the production of robots but of men who are increasingly more capable of efficient production, consumption, and full citizenship in all its political, economic, and social aspects.

---

[1] Estela Cifre de Loubriel, "La Inmigración a Puerto Rico durante el Siglo XIX." San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriquena, 164. 438 pp.

[2] Simon Kuznets and Ernst Rubin, "Immigration and the Foreign Born." New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc. 1954, p. 5. See also, Harry Jerome, "Migration and Business Cycles." New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1926, p. 208; Dorothy S. Thomas, "Social and Economic Aspects of Swedish Population Movements, 1750–1933." New York: Macmillan, 1941, pp. 166–169; Brinley Thomas, "Migration and Economic Growth." Cambridge: University Press, 1954, 362 p.

[3] Op. cit., pp. 2–3, 22, 39, 56.

[4] Charlotte Erickson, "American Industry and the European Immigrant, 1860–1865. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957, pp. 49–50, 216.

[5] John Foster Carr, "The Coming of the Italian", Outlook, LXXXII (1906) pp. 420–22, 426–28.

[6] The official census definition of a migrant is one who moves his residence across at least a county line. He may, of course, move across a State line also.

[7] "Why Labour Leaves the Land." Geneva: International Labour Organization, 1960, 229 pp.

[8] See, for example, Raymond Vernon, "Metropolis, 1985." Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960, "Passim."

[9] Gladys K. Bowles and Conrad Taeuber, "Rural Males Entering and Leaving Working Ages, 1940–50 and 1950–60. Bureau of the Census, Series Census-AMS (P-27), No. 22, August 1956, 65 pp.

[10] Richard E. Mooney, New York Times, Dec. 23, 1965, p. 1.

[11] For quantification of the excess population on the land, country by country, in the 1930's, see Wilbert E. Moore, "Economic Demography of Eastern and Southern Europe." Geneva: League of Nations, 1945, especially pp. 63–64.

[12] Among the relevant sources of information in this field are: Wilhelm Bickel, "Foreign Workers and Economic Growth in Switzerland," United Nations World Population Conference, Belgrade, 1965, WPC/WP/64 (mimeo.) 5 pp.; G. Beijer, "Rural Migrants in Urban Setting." The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963, 327 pp.; Irwin Ross, "European Slogan—Go North, Young Man," New York Times Magazine, May 9, 1965, pp. 34–35; Clarence Senior, "Integration Problems of Recent Rural Migrants to United States Cities," United Nations World Population Conference, Belgrade, 1965, WPC/WP/54 (mimeo.) 6 pp.; R. Weber, "The Employment of Aliens in Germany," International Migration, vol. III, No. 1/2, 1965, pp. 35–44; World Council of Churches, Geneva: "Within Thy Gates," 1964, 94 pp.

[13] Frederic P. Bartlett and Brandon Howell, "Puerto Rico y Su Problema de Población." Santurce: Junta de Planificación, Urbanización y Zonificación, 1946, pp. 68–69.

[14] 1960 data, unless otherwise noted, are from the United States Census of Population, 1960, "Puerto Rico: Number of Inhabitants." P. C. (1), 53 A.

[15] "1964 Economic Report of the Governor." Santurce: Puerto Rico Planning Board, pp. A-10 and A-22.

[16] Arturo Morales Carrión, "Puerto Rico and the Non-Hispanic Caribbean." Río Piedras: University of Puerto Rico Press, 1952, 160 pp.

[17] Ibid., p. 142.

[18] Robert Ernst, "Immigrant Life in New York City, 1825–1863." New York: King's Crown Press, 1949, 331 pp.

[19] 1960 Census of Population, "Puerto Ricans in the United States." Table A.

[20] Cf. Clarence Senior, "Puerto Rican Emigration." Río Piedras: University of Puerto Rico Social Science Research Center, 1947, 166 pp., passim.

[21] "Immigration to Brazil." United Nations, 1950.

[22] Raúl Prébisch, Argentine economist who headed the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America for many years, pointed out that the increase in production per capital had fallen as follows during the late 1950's:

	Percent
1955	3.6
1956	1.8
1958	1.3
1959	0.3

See "Producir y Vivir depende de Latino-America," in Trabajo. Tegucigalpa, Febrero 1962. There has been only spotty improvement in the past few years.

[23] C. Wright Mills, Clarence Senior, and R. K. Goldsen, "The Puerto Rican Journey: New York's Newest Migrants." New York: Harpers, 1950, pp. 43, 185.

[24] The question has been dealt with in some detail with special reference to the Puerto Rican migration in Clarence Senior, "The Puerto Ricans: Strangers—

Then Neighbors." Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965. 128 pp. See also C. P. Kindleberger, "Mass Migration, Then and Now." Foreign Affairs. July 1965, vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 647–657.

[25] Roy G. Francis, "The Predictive Process." Río Piedras: Social Science Research Center, 1960, p. 112.

[26] See Raymond Vernon, "Metropolis, 1985." Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960. pp. 48–49, 51, 206, 212; and Roy B. Helfgott, et al., "Made in New York." Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. pp. 94–98, 115. Vernon pointed out that "the region's capacity to supply its own labor needs, without resort to migration, is growing." P. 212.

[27] For more on the Puerto Ricans in our most cosmopolitan State (in which one agency with a peculiar idea of race counted 169 different racial mixtures a few years ago!) see Andrew W. Lind, "Hawaii's People." Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1955, 116 pp.

[28] 1960 Census of Population, "State of Birth." PC(2)2A, p. 177.

[29] Sixteenth Census of the United States, Puerto Rico: "Migration Between Municipalities," op. cit.

[30] Peter Gregory "The Labor Market in Puerto Rico," in Moore and Feldman, "Labor Commitment and Social Change in Developing Areas." New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960. p. 145.

[31] Joe E. Martin, "Off Farm Migration—Some of Its Characteristics and Effects Upon Agriculture in Weakley County, Tennessee." Knoxville: University of Tennessee, Agricultural Experiment Station, August 1958, pp. 20–21.

[32] "The Puerto Rican Journey," op. cit., pp. 60–65, 146–52, 183, 188.

[33] Color classifications are probably among the least reliable data tabulated by the U.S. Census. Such data were not even gathered in Puerto Rico in 1960. The 1960 Census report, "Puerto Ricans in the United States" warned that "differences between successive censuses in the proportion of nonwhite persons among Puerto Ricans may reflect changes in attitudes about racial classification as well as selective migration. * * *" p. ix.

[34] Clarence Senior, "Puerto Rican Emigration." Río Piedras: Social Science Research Center, 1947, p. 32.

[35] The reports of the ramp survey were published quarterly and cumulatively by year by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Department of Labor under the title "Characteristics of Passengers Who Traveled by Air Between Puerto Rico and the United States." Material in this section is derived from these reports unless otherwise noted.

[36] Clarence Senior, "The Puerto Rican Journey," pp. 25–26, 180.

[37] Committee on Human Resources, "Puerto Rico's Manpower Needs and Supply." 1957.

[38] "1964 Informe Económico al Gobernador." San Juan, Junta de Planificación. 1965 Primera Parte, pp. 157–169.

[39] U.S. Department of Justice, San Juan Office, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[40] "Puerto Rican Emigration," pp. 21–22.

[41] 1960 Census of Population, "State of Birth," PC(2)2A, pp. 172–177.

[42] E. G. Ravenstein, "The Laws of Migration". Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. vol. 48 (June 1885) 167–235; vol. 52 (March 1889) 241–305.

[43] Dorothy S. Thomas, "Social & Economic Aspects of Swedish Population Movements, 1750–1933." New York: Macmillan, 1941, pp. 299–303.

[44] Henry S. Shryock, Jr., "The Efficiency of Internal Migration in the United States", in Report on International Population Conference, International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, Vienna, 1959, pp. 685–694.

[45] C. E. Lively and Conrad Taeuber, "Rural Migration in the United States." Washington: Works Program Administration, 1939, pp. 23, 31–32.

[46] Ibid., p. xvi.

[47] Sidney Goldstein, "Pattern of Mobility, 1910–1950: The Norristown Study." Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1958, 254 pp.

[48] N. L. Sims, "Elements of Rural Sociology." New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1934, pp. 289–96.

[49] Robert S. Hutchinson, "Migration and Industrial Development in Tennessee." Nashville: Tennessee Legislative Council Committee, 1958, pp. 160–161.

[50] Willam H. Metzler and Ward F. Porter, "Employment and Underemployment of Rural People in the Upper Monongahela Valley, West Virginia." Morgantown: West Virginia University Agricultural Experiment Station, 1957, p. 58.

[51] Puerto Rican Emigration, p. 32.

[52] Mills, Senior and Goldsen, op. cit., p. 57.

[53] This has been a well-known cause of illness among immigrants for almost three centuries. See H. B. M. Murphy, (ed.) "Flight and Resettlement." Paris: UNESCO, 1955, p. 213. A publication of 1678 describes the "melancholia, insomnia anorexia, weakness, anxiety, palpitations of the heart, smothering sensations," etc., which were found to result from nostalgia.

[54] "1964 Informe Económico al Gobernador." San Juan: Junta de Planificación, 1965. Primera Parte, pp. 147, A–21.

[55] Ibid., p. 154; "Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1964, p. 218.

[56] For a treatment of the transition in which families in Puerto Rico are involved, see Melvin M. Tumin and Arnold Feldman, "Social Class and Social Change in Puerto Rico." Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961. chs. 15–16. The Columbia University study found that "All adult members of the family are expected to work and to contribute to the support of the house in some way", op. cit., pp. 95–96.

[57] 1960 Census of Population, "Puerto Rico: Detailed Characteristics." PC(1) 53D Puerto Rico, table 77.

[58] José Hernández Alvarez, "Return Migration in Puerto Rico", Rio Piedras: Social Science Research Center, University of Puerto Rico, 1964, p. 6.

[59] Quoted by Hernández, op. cit., pp. 6–8.

[60] Puerto Rican Journey, op. cit., p. 57.

[61] Workers insured have risen from 21.4 million in 1939 to 42.4 million in 1963. Initial claims filed per week have varied with the rise and fall of unemployment from an average of 29,000 in 1944 to 370,000 in 1958. The year 1963 showed an average of 297,000. Average duration of benefits ranged from 7.7 weeks in 1944 to 14.8 in 1958. See "Health Education and Welfare Trends," 1964, part I, p. 89.

[62] Unemployment Insurance Statistics, February 1965, p. 9; May 1965, p. 12.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Quoted by Hernández, op. cit., p. 13.

[65] These and other data from the special tabulation of the 1960 census mentioned above are from Hernández, op. cit., passim. There is a wealth of statistical data and analysis in the manuscript which cannot be included here.

[66] Ibid., p. 52.

[67] Idem., p. 87.

[68] "When Children Move from School to School." Washington: Association for Childhood Education International, 1960, 36 pp.

[69] For an example see H. M. Williams and Joseph W. Dupuis, "Exchanging Cultural Values: A Study of Newcomers in Columbus, Ohio, Public Schools". Columbus Public Schools, June, 1964, 44 pp. (mimeo.) See also the fascinating story of the Southern mountaineer family moving to Detroit during World War II. Harriette Arnow, "The Doll Maker." New York: Collier Books, 1961. 571 pp. The Federal Office of Education has published many aids to school systems facing difficulties in this area. One is "Improving English Skills of Culturally Different Youth in Large Cities," edited by Arno Jewett, Joseph Mersand and Doris V. Gunderson. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964, 216 pp. Specific programs in Detroit, Philadelphia, Chicago, Houston, and New York City are set forth as possible patterns for other cities.

[70] See the Pulitzer prize-winning treatment of immigration to this country, Oscar Handlin, "The Uprooted." Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1951. 310 pp., especially pp. 177–179; and something of the experience of the New York City schools in "The First Fifty Years, 1898–1948." 50th Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools. New York: Board of Education, 1949, 204 pp. One of the many autobiographical accounts of immigrant reactions to the schools is found in J. R. Schwartz, "Orchard Street." New York: Comet Press, 1960, pp. 50–78, 81, and 83.

[71] See Peter H. Rossi, "Why Families Move." New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1955, 220 pp., for a study of the social psychology of urban residential mobility.

[72] Ibid., pp. 134–136.

[73] "The Southern Mountaineer in Cincinnati." Mayor's Friendly Relations Committee and Social Service Association of Greater Cincinnati, 1954, p. 21.

[74] "Youth in the Ghetto." New York: Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, 1964, pp. 177–179.

[75] Patricia Sexton, "Education and Income." New York: Viking Press, 1961, p. 96.

[76] Blanche Robins Kasindorf, "The Effect of Pupil Transiency on Pupil Functioning," Publications No. 202, March 1963, 127 pp.; Joseph Justman, "Academic Aptitude and Reading Test Scores of Disadvantaged Children Showing Varying Degrees of Mobility", 11 pp.; Edward Frankel and George Forlano, "Pupil Mobility and Variations in I.Q. Trends", 11 pp.; Edward Frankel and George Forlano, "Mobility As a Factor in the Performance of Urban Disadvantaged Pupils on Tests of Mental Ability", 9 pp. New York: Board of Education.

[77] Thomas S. Smith, "Consequences of Pupil Mobility Within the Inter-City". Chicago: University of Chicago: Department of Sociology, Center for Social Organization Studies, 1965, p. 21.

[78] Samuel M. Goodman, Lorraine K. Diamond and David J. Fox. "Who Are the Puerto Rican Pupils in the New York City Public Schools?." New York: Board of Education, 1956, pp. 16, 71, 75, 82. The same general trend was found in reading English and understanding spoken English and in arithmetic.

[79] Ibid., p. 81. Because of the inherently misleading character of what are essentially achievement tests but lay claim to testing "native ability" and because their injustice falls most heavily upon children of minority groups, those from farming areas and those from other cultures, the New York Board of Education in 1964 ordered all group intelligence testing discontinued. An explanation of the move is found in Joseph O. Loretan, "The Discontinuance of Group I.Q. Tests", The Bulletin, National Association of Secondary School Principals. Vol. 49 (January 1965) No. 297, pp. 70–77; Joseph O. Loretan, "The Decline and Fall

of Group Intelligence Testing", Teaching College Record, vol. 67 (October 1965) No. 1, pp. 10–17.

[80] "New York City Public Schools: Facts and Figures", 1964–65, p. 37.

[81] "The Puerto Ricans in New York City." New York: Welfare Council, 1948. pp. 14, 36–38.

[82] Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics, unpublished data.

[83] Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, 1955–56, Part II, "Puerto Rican Children," New York, pp. 14–15; "Meeting the Needs of Puerto Rican Pupils in New York City Public Schools," Staff Bulletin, Special Supplement, Mar. 23, 1964, p. ii.

[84] This and other special programs to establish better understanding between the Puerto Rican newcomers and the children of longer-term residents are described in Staff Bulletin, op. cit.; John B. King, "From Caguas to New York", San Juan Review, vol. 2 (June 1965) no. 5, pp. 62–64; Jim Douglas, "New York Schools Encourage Bilingualism", San Juan Star, July 23, 1965, p. 16.

[85] Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, Statistical Section, School year 1962–63. New York: Board of Education, table 35, p. 29.

[86] Oscar Handlin, "The Newcomers: Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a changing Metropolis." Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1962, p. 118.

[87] Mills, Senior, and Goldsen, op. cit., pp. 52–3.

[88] Clyde V. Kiser, "Sea Island to City." New York: Columbia University Press, 1932, p. 10. See also Louise V. Kennedy, "The Negro Peasant Turns Cityward." New York: Columbia University Press, 1930. 270 pp.

[89] "Rural Migration in the United States," p. 79.

[90] For empirical research indicating this point, see Tumin and Feldman, op. cit., pp. 111–115, 164–184, 450–511.

[91] "Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957." Washington: Bureau of the Census, 1960, p. 73.

[92] "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1965, tables Nos. 47, 48, and 55.

[93] Clarence D. Long, "An Overview of Postwar Labor Market Developments", in Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Social Security Conference. Kalamazoo: Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1962, pp. 9–23.

[94] Mills, Senior and Goldsen, op. cit., Ch. 4.

[95] Clarence Senior and Douglas Manley, "A Report on Jamaican Migration to Great Britain." Kingston: The Government Printers, 1955, pp. 30–34.

[96] United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[97] 1960 Census of Population, Puerto Rico: Detailed Characteristics. PC(1) 53D, 1962, p. 236.

[98] José L. Janer, José L. Vásquez and Nidia R. Morales, "Puerto Rico's Demographic Situation: Some of Its Recent Changes and Their Transfer Value." San Jual: University of Puerto Rico School of Medicine, May 1962. 40 pp. The figures are also given in El Mundo, 10 de mayo, 1962: "Proyección Poblacional de Puerto Rico."

[99] A. J. Jaffe, "People, Jobs and Economic Development." Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1959, p. 157.

[100] Economic Development Administration, "Data Sheet on the Fomento Program," Nov. 5, 1964.

[101] "1961 Economic Report to the Governor." Santurce: Puerto Rico Planning Board, 1962, p. 88.

[102] Another approach would be to compare overall employment for 1950 and 1964—a 15-year period. There was a rise in employment during that period from 596,000 to 654,000, or 58,000.

[103] "Señala Isla Espera Tener 2,000 Fabricas para 1975," El Mundo, 7 de Julio, 1962.

[104] Vincente Guzmán Sato and Vernon R. Esteves, "El Problema del Desempleo en Puerto Rico." San Juan: Banco Gubernamental de Fomento, 1963, p. 18.

[105] Calculated from the monthly reports of the Puerto Rico Department of Labor: "Employment and Unemployment in Puerto Rico," July 1963–June 1964.

[106] Ibid., July 1964–March 1965.

[107] Arthur F. Neef, "International Unemployment Rates, 1960–64," Monthly Labor Review. March 1965, pp. 256–259.

[108] "1964 Informe Económico al Gobernador," op. cit., p. A–21. It might be noted that the labor force participation rate in the United States in 1960 was 57.4 percent. Projections to 1975 indicate an expectation that it will stay at about 57 percent, according to the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1964, p. 217.

[109] Ibid., pp. 136–138.

[110] Herbert Bienstock, "Education and Training." New York: Bureau of Labor Statistics, July 22, 1962, p. 9.

[111] "Rector de U.P.R. Revela Hay Mas Oportunidades de Empleo que Graduados Salen Anualmente," El Mundo, 29 de agosto, 1962.

[112] "657 Industrial Technicians Seen Needed Here by 1964," San Juan Star, July 25, 1962.

[113] See "Puerto Rico's Manpower Needs and Supply," 1957.

[114] "Puerto Rican Emigration," op. cit., pp. 18, 31.

[115] Outstanding in its treatment of the human factors in the immigration which built the United States is, "The Uprooted," op. cit.

[116] "The Newcomers: Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis," op. cit., draws parallels between the Puerto Rican and his immigrant predecessors.

[117] Mills, et al., p. 146; see also 98–99, 136–38, 141–45 and 203.

[118] Robert W. O'Brien, "A Survey of the Puerto Ricans in Lorain, Ohio." Lorain: Neighborhood House Association, 1954. 77 pp.

[119] Daniel Donchian, "A Survey of New Haven's Newcomers: The Puerto Ricans." New Haven: Human Relations Council of Greater New Haven. May 1959, p. 25; Thomas P. Imse, "Puerto Ricans in Buffalo," Buffalo: Board of Community Relations, 1961, 18 pp.; Fred T. Golub, "The Pureto Rican Worker in Perth Amboy, New Jersey." New Brunswick: Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University, March 1956, 18 pp.; Joseph W. Hernández, "The Puerto Rican Section: A Study in Social Transition." Unpublished typescript, 59 pp. questionnaire; "Philadelphia's Puerto Rican Population." Philadelphia: Commission on Human Relations, 1964, 30 pp.; Arthur Siegel, et al., "Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia," Commission on Human Relations, 1954 (see also a revised publication with the same name, prepared by Raymond Metauten, edited by Burton I. Gordin. June 1959, 39 pp.).

[120] "Puerto Ricans in New York City." New York: Welfare Council, 1948, p. 16.

[121] "Report on Survey of Brooklyn Agencies Rendering Services to Puerto Ricans." Brooklyn Council for Social Planning, June 1953, p. 11 (mimeo.).

[122] Mills, et al., op. cit., p. 114.

[123] "The Puerto Rican Study: 1953–57." New York: Board of Education, 1958. 265 pp.

[124] Ibid., p. 131.

[125] Oct. 26, 1959.

[126] For recent data on such aspects of the migration as dispersion, the integration process, education, occupations, incomes, relations with other low-income groups, participation in business, political, and civic and religious activities, see

Clarence Senior, "The Puerto Ricans: Strangers—Then Neighbors." Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965, 128 pp.

[127] Puerto Rican Emigration, op. cit., p. 107.

[128] H. V. Muhsam, "Revision of the Concept 'the Money Value of a Man'," in the Proceedings, International Population Conference. Vienna, International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, 1959. pp. 106–111.

[129] Mills, Senior and Goldsen, op. cit., pp. 75–76.

[130] A survey by Pulse, Inc., prepared for Station WHOM.

[131] Philip H. Dougherty, "Family on Relief: A Study in Poverty," The New York Times, Apr. 5, 1964; Moreland Commission on Welfare, "Public Welfare in the State of New York," Albany, N.Y., Jan. 15, 1963; "Public Welfare—Myth vs. Fact," Citizens Committee for Children of New York, Inc., January 1963.

[132] Puerto Rican Emigration. Op. cit., pp. 16–18.

[133] William James, "The Energies of Man" (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1926) and the application of this concept to social affairs in Hans L. Zetterberg, "Social Theory and Social Practice." New York: The Bedminster Press, 1962, pp. 77–80.

[134] Janer, et al., op. cit., p. 13.

[135] "Blueprint for Further Action Toward Quality Integrated Education." New York: Board of Education, Mar. 5, 1965, app. M–1.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This selected bibliography includes only those items which contain significant or fairly extensive references to Puerto Ricans. An attempt has been made to include the major items that were published by July 1, 1965. The bibliography does not include the many useful items published by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Migration Division that describe the work of the division or present official policy statements.

The bibliography is divided into two sections. The first beginning on page 765 contains annotations of articles, essays, reports, speeches, and surveys. The second beginning on page 791 includes annotations of books only. It should be noted that articles or essays about Puerto Ricans which appeared as a chapter or a section of a book are included in the first rather than the second section of this bibliography.

SECTION I. ARTICLES, ESSAYS, REPORTS, SPEECHES, AND SURVEYS

Abrams, Charles. "How to Remedy Our 'Puerto Rican Problems'." Commentary 19: 120–127. February 1955. This material also was included in Charles Abrams' "Forbidden Neighbors." Harper, 1955, ch. 6, "The Puerto Rican Airlift," pp. 56–69.

Abrams sees the "problem" as one primarily related to the fact that mainland Americans tend to refuse to recognize that they force Puerto Ricans to live, generally, under sordid, inadequate conditions. Need to help Puerto Rican migrants establish roots in their new communities. Need to provide more and better housing and employment opportunities, and improved education. Coupled with this, Puerto Ricans need to exert initiative and produce leadership able to cope with the problems.

Abrams, Charles. "New York's New Slums." New Leader. January 1956, pp. 20–23.

Puerto Ricans face a problem of insufficient and inadequate housing. A housing shortage existed in New York City prior to the increased flow of

Puerto Rican migration in the 1940's. The shortage was not caused by the migration. As demand for housing increased, landlords converted housing to smaller, multiple units deriving four to five times the original base rent.

✓ AFL–CIO Community Service Activities. "Our Puerto Rican Fellow Citizens." AFL–CIO. 1960. 44 pp.

The report of a national conference sponsored by the AFL–CIO Community Service Activities in January 1960. The report includes helpful background papers on "Puerto Rican Culture and Organized Social Services" by Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J., and "Family Customs of Puerto Ricans and Organized Social Service" by Sister Thomas Marie. The discussion groups focused on how government and private agencies could best assist Puerto Rican migrants cope with problems related to living in a complex urban setting with which they are generally unfamiliar. Recommendations for action in the areas of family life and child care, welfare, recreation and leisure time, housing, health and hospital services, and consumer problems were made by the conference participants.

Anastasi, Anne, and de Jesus, Cruz. "Languge Development and Non-Verbal IQ of Puerto Rican Preschool Children in New York City." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 48: 357–366. July 1953.

Comparison of 50 Puerto Rican preschoolers with same number of white and Negro preschool children previously tested. The Puerto Rican children equaled the norms of the other two groups despite their low socioeconomic status. The researchers concluded that the considerable adult contact in the home life of the young Puerto Rican children is a positive factor in their early linguistic development. In addition they tentatively conclude that "inferior performance of older Puerto Rican children tested in other studies may result from cumulative effects of very low socioeconomic level, as well as from intellectual and emotional effects of bilingualism. Prior to school entrance. when bilingualism has not become a serious problem for such a group, test performance and language development appear to be normal."

Anderson, Virginia. "Teaching English to Puerto Rican Pupils". Tells how this junior high school teacher uses her knowledge of the culture of Puerto Rico to help her students learn English more successfully.

Arter, Rhetta M. "Between Two Bridges: A Study of Human Relations in the Lower East Side of Manhattan, the Area Served by the Educational Alliance". Human Relations Monograph No. 5. Interpretation by Dan W. Dodson. New York University Center for Human Relations, 1956. 32 pp.

Considerable hostility toward Puerto Ricans found among Jews in this research study. However, none of the 479 non-Puerto Rican families interviewed reported any negative experiences of open conflict with a Puerto Rican person. Nearly all negative comments about Puerto Ricans had been based on hearsay or impersonal relationships. On the other hand, the friendly comments were generally based on personal experiences. Major human relations problem as seen by the Puerto Rican families was feeling isolated and rejected. They felt a concern to become accepted. The researchers suggest that the Alliance move from a largely Jewish interest and program to a more multiethnic culture agency.

Arter, Rhetta M. "Mid-City". Human Relations Monograph No. 3. New York University, Center for Human Relations Studies. 1953. 32 pp.

A study of human relations in the area of Manhattan served by Christ Church House. Concluded that Spanish-speaking families will participate in community activities when "they become convinced that their participation is desired". Says that Christ Church had been "in the community but not of it". Suggests more community involvement by this and other churches.

Bates, Barbara. "New York and Puerto Ricans". Survey, 85: 487. September 1949.

Puerto Ricans were receiving assistance from many public and private groups in New York City, especially the board of education. Indicates ways that New York City schools, by including the study of various national and ethnic groups, intercultural festivals, and home visits were trying to help Puerto Rican children maintain a feeling of worth and become accepted. Bates believes Federal Government should relocate Puerto Rican migrants in areas of the United States outside of New York City to improve their housing and job opportunities.

Bender, Lauretta and Nichtern, Sol. "The Puerto Rican Boys in New York City". pp. 245–264. In Seward, C. (ed.), "Clincial Studies in Culture Conflict". Ronald Press, 1958.

Two clinical case studies "presented as examples of deviant behavior and sequential pathology arising from culture conflict superimposed on specific aspects of personality development". The boys tended to view the external environment as threatening, to strike back aggressively at persons, and to withdraw into fantasy. The authors report this as fairly common among disturbed children of Puerto Rican origin observed in the children's section of one psychiatric hospital in New York City. This behavior leads to a clinical impression of acute psychosis. However, the authors suggest that the behavior distortions more likely result from language barriers and culture conflicts.

Berger, S. "Puerto Rican Migrants Create Housing Problems". Real Estate News, 33: 265–267. August 1942.

Assumed migrants to be the cause of slum housing conditions. Defends the landlords on the issue of slum conditions in New York City neighborhoods in which Puerto Rican families live.

Berkowitz, Elaine. "Family Attitudes and Practices of Puerto Rican and Non-Puerto Rican Pupils". High Points, vol. XLIII (March 1961) No. 3. pp. 25–34.

Report on a study of junior high school girls in New York City done for the purpose of improving a home economics course. Emphasis on home, family relationships, meal chores, etc. Attitudes held by both groups similar in seven major points; dissimilar in three. Latter seem to arise from classical "second-generationites". "Puerto Rican families share more activities than do non-Puerto Rican families."

Bowman, Leroy. "The Puerto Rican in America". Humanist, 22: 27–29. January–February 1962.

Eighty-five percent of the migrants left jobs in Puerto Rico in search of better jobs on the mainland. By beginning to emerge in politics and trade unions, and forming cultural, social, religious, and fraternal organizations, Puerto Ricans are coping with the problems of economic and housing discrimination and exploitation coupled with those associated with cultural adjustments.

Breisler, B. "Looking for the Promised Land." Saturday Evening Post 231: 18–19+. April 11, 1959.

Emphasizes that Puerto Rican migrants come to the mainland in search of economic opportunity. For most of them the new life is a struggle, and sometimes a disappointment. Author notes ways that some persons and groups on the mainland reach out to assist the migrant and calls on more persons to help them.

Brooks, Tom. "The Puerto Rican Story." Industrial Bulletin, (N.Y.) 39: 6–12. June 1960.

Puerto Rican migrant comes to New York in search of better jobs and greater opportunities. Most come having been semiskilled, skilled, or white-collar workers in Puerto Rico. Over 90 percent come from urban areas. Eighty-five percent to ninety-five percent have always been able to be self-supporting on the mainland.

Carleton, R. O. "New Aspects of Puerto Rican Migration." Monthly Labor Review, 83: 133–135. February 1960.

Author points out the significant return migration to Puerto Rico as demand in Puerto Rico for skilled and semiskilled labor has increased. Increased earnings of Puerto Ricans coupled with substantial reductions in air fare since the end of World War II have made island-mainland visiting and 2-way migration commonplace. Assumes that both will continue.

"Channel Puerto Rican Migration." Commonweal, 47: 484. Feb. 27, 1948.

New York City officials were unprepared for the increased migration from Puerto Rico following World War II. Little was being done about deplorable housing conditions which existed prior to the arrival of the new migrants. Called upon officials and the general population to assist the newcomers adjust to the problems encountered in settling in New York City and relocating elsewhere on the mainland.

"Chicago's Puerto Ricans." New Republic, 130: 3–4. Feb. 22, 1954.

When the recession resulted in increased unemployment in Chicago some Puerto Rican newcomers needed economic assistance before they had met the 1-year residence requirement to receive relief. The residence requirements were not relaxed. The welfare commissioner used relief funds to send some Puerto Ricans back to Puerto Rico. He also went to try to discourage migration. Bitterness resulted. The migration into Chicago of other citizens had not been discouraged. Some persons charged that the commissioner's policy had been unfair to Puerto Ricans.

Clark, Blake. "The Puerto Rican Problem in New York." Reader's Digest, 62: 61–65. February 1953.

Although citing the positive contributions Puerto Ricans make in industry, business, and the arts, Clark focuses on the problems faced by Puerto Ricans in New York City: Exploitation as consumers; crowded, substandard housing; and poor living conditions in general. Assumes, without providing adequate supporting evidence, that Puerto Ricans have a relatively high crime and delinquency rate. Sees Puerto Ricans forging ahead slowly, but suggests that the real solution is for Puerto Rican migrants to bypass New York City and dispense throughout the United States.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Department of Labor, Migration Division. New York City. "Report of the Third Migration Conference." Migration Division, 1958. 12 pp.

A report of the discussions held between 26 New York officials and their counterparts in the Commonwealth Government during January 1958 in Puerto Rico. Many suggestions of ways various Government agencies and official personnel can humanely speed the process of adjustment newcomers make to a metropolitan environment.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Department of Labor, Migration Division. New York City. "A Summary in Facts and Figures: 1964–65 Edition." Migration Division, 1965. 21 pp.

In charts, graphs, and tables basic data on Puerto Rico and Puerto Rican migration is presented. A revised edition of this statistical guide is published annually.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Department of Labor, Migration Division. New York City. "The Jobs We Do." Migration Division, 1952. 16 pp.

A brochure that presents in words and pictures a survey of the wide range of occupations—from unskilled to professional—engaged in by Puerto Ricans on the mainland.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Department of Labor, Migration Division. New York City. "Trade Unions and Puerto Rican Workers." Migration Division, 1952. 22 pp.

Report on a conference of labor leaders and Commonwealth officials held in May 1952. A discussion of ways to facilitate the movement into organized labor of Puerto Rican workers on the mainland.

Community Council of Greater New York. "Manhattan Communities: Summary Statements of Population Charateristics." Community Council of Greater New York. Research Department. 1955. 75 pp.

Presentation of United States Census and other data available at the time on the various neighborhoods, health areas, and communities in the Borough of Manhattan.

Community Council of Greater New York. "Our Changing Community." Community Council of Greater New York. 1957. 45 pp.

Report of a forum dealing with changes in the demographic characteristics of New York City's population. Focus is on the significance of these changes for health and welfare organizations, both public and private. There are references to the data on persons and families of Puerto Rican origin. Participants included Stanley P. Davies, Buel Gallagher, Frank S. Howe, Roscoe, P. Kandle, J. Donald Kingsley, Lawrence M. Orton, Clarence Senior, Harry Shapiro, and Ralph Whelan.

Davis, H. D. "Golden Door." New Statesman, 50: 355–356. Sept. 24, 1955.

Assumes that Puerto Rican migrants generally do not commit themselves to establishing permanent roots on the mainland. Author believes that probably a majority of the migrants would prefer to return to Puerto Rico if they could support their families adequately there. Mentions some of the economic and social problems that confront Puerto Ricans on the mainland. Believes, that "the solution of the Puerto Rican problem" lies in officials and the general public helping the migrants as "fellow citizens" and also assist them in settling throughout the United States.

De Rowan, Josefina. "New York's Latin Quarter. The Story of Our Little-Known Fellow Americans from Puerto Rico Who Live in Manhattan." Inter-American, 5: 10–13+. January 1946.

Estimated that 150,000 to 200,000 persons of Puerto Rican origin were living in New York City in 1946. Though living in many neighborhoods in the city, there were large concentrations in East Harlem, parts of Brooklyn, and Washington Heights. They had to cope with many problems such as poor housing; low paying jobs, often under undesirable conditions; unfamiliarity with the ways of a complex city; and a language barrier. The demand for labor, the influence of friends already here, and the relative ease of transportation tend to draw Puerto Ricans to New York. Once in the city, they try to maintain the customs of their Puerto Rican origin. After a period of adjustment they seem to make economic and social progress.

✓ check Tuley

Donchian, Daniel. "A Survey of New Haven's Newcomers: The Puerto Ricans." Human Relations Council of Greater New Haven (Conn.), May 1959. 36 pp.

A thorough field study done by Spanish-speaking interviewers. The research team used a sample of 888 persons of Puerto Rican origin out of approximately 2,000 Puerto Ricans living in New Haven. Seventy percent migrated in search of self or family betterment; i.e., economic and educational opportunities. Most had migrated to New Haven directly from Puerto Rico. Most migrants were in family groups, young from small towns or rural areas in Puerto Rico, with an educational level among adults above the median level of education in Puerto Rico. Nearly three-fourths planned to remain permanently in New Haven in spite of problems. Major problems were crowded, substandard, high-cost housing; low skill jobs and low family income; and language problems. Donchian urges New Haven residents to find ways to "accelerate their (Puerto Ricans') adjustment."

✓ Eagle, Morris. "The Puerto Ricans in New York City." In Glazer, N., and McEntire, D. (eds.) Housing and Minority Groups. University of California Press, 1960. Ch. 5, pp. 144–177.

Eagle's field research, based on a carefully selected sample of households, demonstrates that Puerto Rican migrants do not create slums. Due generally to low incomes, some discrimination, and the desire of some landlords to make immediate gains, a large proportion of migrants move into already existing slums or deteriorating housing. Over a period of several years the trend among Puerto Ricans is to move into better housing with more adequate space and facilities, and to pay less per dwelling unit than the new arrivals.

"Economic Status of Puerto Ricans: United States and New York, New York." Manpower Report of the President, 1964. U.S. Government Printing Office. 1964. Pp. 115–118.

An interpretation of the 1960 census data on Puerto Ricans in the areas of education, labor force, employment and unemployment, income levels, and occupational distribution. Discusses the difficulties facing the Puerto Rican newcomers. Does point out the significant gains made by second-generation Puerto Ricans on the mainland. Includes the data in tabular form. Incorrectly uses the terms immigrants and immigration in discussing Puerto Ricans moving to the mainland.

"Effect of Labor Costs and Migration on Puerto Rican Economy." Monthly Labor Review, 76: 625–627. No. 6, June 1953.

A summary of articles by Simon Rottenberg and Clarence Senior originally published in The Annals, January 1953. See annotation in this bibliography under Senior.

Fantino, Eileen. "Children of Poverty." Commonweal, 62: 271–274. June 17, 1955.

Points out the ways that some New Yorkers exploit many Puerto Rican migrants. The migrants come in search of improved opportunities. The Welfare Department indicates that Puerto Ricans get off of relief at least as quickly as any other residents and are always eager to work. But the problems related to the intolerable conditions of poverty and slum life lead some to seek escape—both psychological and physical. Refers to drug addition and neuroses. Author does not provide data indicating the extent of problems. Charges social agencies with some indifference to the plight of those Puerto Ricans in poverty.

Ferree, William (Fr.); Fitzpatrick, Joseph (Fr.); Illich, John (Fr.). "Report on the First Conference on the Spiritual Care of Puerto Rican Migrants." Archdiocese of New York. 1955. 228 pp.

The Conference was held in Puerto Rico with an attendance of priests from both the mainland and Puerto Rico. The working papers provide background interpretations of patterns of culture in Puerto Rico and changes on the mainland. A comprehensive presentation of the concerns of the Roman Catholic Church relative to the varied problems of Puerto Rican migrants.

Finocchiaro, Mary. "Puerto Rican Newcomers in Our Schools." Journal of Educational Sociology, 28: 157–166. No. 4, December 1954.

As the schools shifted from the "melting pot" and "assimiliation" approaches to newcomers to that of "cultural pluralism" special education programs were needed. The author describes several of the procedures instituted by the New York City schools to "hasten the process of integration" for the nearly 50,000 children of Puerto Rican origin attending the New York City public schools in 1954. These included curriculum modifications, adjustments in pupil classification, teacher inservice training focusing on the cultural patterns of Puerto Rico and teaching English as a second language. Some suggestions to the classroom teacher are made by the author.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. (Fr.). "Delinquency and the Puerto Ricans." Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Migration Division. 1959. 18 pp.

In an address to the Fordham University School of Business the author provides a historical sketch of earlier groups of newcomers to New York City and the charges of crime made against them. As was true with others "delinquency is not something the Puerto Ricans bring with them."

In the light of cultural conflicts and the problems facing Puerto Rican newcomers "the marvel is not that there has been so much delinquency, but that there has been so little." Urges persons to "receive the Puerto Ricans with understanding, dignity and respect * * *"

Fleischer, Belton M. "Some Economic Aspects of Puerto Rican Migration to the United States." Review of Economics and Statistics, 45: 221–230. No. 3, August 1963.

Based on research for the author's Ph. D. dissertation. The study documents the high correlations during the late 1940's and early 1950's between amount of migration to the mainland and labor demand on the mainland, lowered transportation costs and increase in the population of labor force age in Puerto Rico. Once here the newcomers exerted a pull on others in Puerto Rico. They provided word-of-mouth publicity about job opportunities on the mainland, and helped the migrants finance their transportation, find jobs, and get settled.

Furst, Philip W. "Puerto Ricans in New York City." Puerto Rican Social Services, Inc., New York City. March 1963. 81 pp. + appendices.

A compilation and interpretation of recent data on Puerto Ricans in the areas of education, health, delinquency, migration, housing, employment, and agency programs. Many sources of data were explored—public and private, and official, and unofficial. Emphasizes the indices of social problems that confront Puerto Ricans. However, does point out signs of gains especially by those here longer and the second generation. Concludes that "the hysteria of the late forties has subsided * * *" and the substitution of a more rational approach "to the whole situation." At times, more precise data are needed for the interpretations presented to be considered valid.

Gernes, Arthur C. "Implications of Puerto Rican Migration to the Continent Outside New York City." Address before the Ninth Annual Convention on Social Orientation, University of Puerto Rico, Dec. 10, 1955. Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor. Migration division, New York City, 1956. (Also printed in Spanish.)

Discusses the role of the U.S. Employment Service in influencing the dispersion process. Points out the value of Puerto Rico as a source of manpower for the mainland labor force.

Glazer, Nathan. "New York's Puerto Ricans." Commentary, 26: 469–478. December 1958.

A critical review of three books: Berle, B. "80 Puerto Rican Families in New York City;" Padilla, E., "Up From Puerto Rico;" and, Rand, C., "The Puerto Ricans." Explores several aspects of life among Puerto Rican newcomers in New York City. His assumption that Puerto Rican children were not interested in higher education is unsupported and questionable.

Glazer, Nathan. "The Puerto Ricans." Commentary, 36: 1–9. July 1963. This article appeared in expanded form in Glazer, N., and Moynihan, D. "Beyond the Melting Pot." The MIT Press and Harvard University Press, 1963. Ch. 2, "The Puerto Ricans," pp. 86–136.

Utilizing census data and information from other sources, the author provides a concise analysis of the problems confronting Puerto Ricans in New York City and points out some of the gains made. Refers to the general lack of color prejudice among Puerto Ricans as possibly their most significant, long-run contribution to life in New York City.

Golob, Fred. "The Puerto Rican Worker in Perth Amboy, New Jersey." Occasional Studies: No. 2. Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University, March 1956. 18 pp.

A study of employment integration of Puerto Rican workers in Perth Amboy. Conclusions based on "questionnaires sent to local plants, and informal interviews with top management personnel, union leaders, community leaders, and public administrators and officials at all levels of government." About 3,000 Puerto Ricans in Perth Amboy in 1955. Demand for unskilled workers had attracted the newcomers. As new arrivals learned of job openings that encouraged friends and relatives back in Puerto Rico to migrate. Management was generally satisfied with the Puerto Rican workers. "As the Puerto Rican becomes assimilated, his work patterns approach that of the non-Puerto Rican."

Gray, Lois. "The Labor Union and Puerto Ricans in New York City". Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. December 1963. Reprint No. 147 of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

A well-documented case study of the variety of programs labor unions in New York City have developed in relation to their Puerto Rican members. Gives special attention to the role of the A.F. of L.–CIO. Central Labor Council in its campaign against some employers and unions who exploit Puerto Rican workers. Points out that more than half of the adult Puerto Rican population in New York City are members of labor unions. Thus what unions do, or fail to do, with respect to their Puerto Rican members is important for the Puerto Rican community in New York City.

Grieser, Normal. "Airborne from San Juan". New Republic, 117: 21–24. Nov. 3, 1947.

Points out that most Puerto Ricans come to New York City in an effort to improve their living standards. Their goal is self-betterment. Upon arrival they meet general hostility and are blamed for the city's slum problems, which actually existed prior to their arrival. Newspaper headlines play up the problems, but do not refer to the largest number who are fully self-supporting, or the shopowning and professional middle- and upper-income groups.

Hammer, Richard. "Report From a Spanish Harlem 'Fortress' ". New York Times Magazine, Jan. 5, 1964, pp. 22, 32+.

Reporter's attempt to present the feelings of Puerto Rican youth on one block in East Harlem. States that "most of the young people in Spanish Harlem are bitter and disillusioned". Impressions based on a limited number of interviews with young people, most of whom had dropped out of school.

Helfgott, Roy B. "Puerto Rican Integration in the Skirt Industry in New York City". In Antonovsky, A. and Lorwin, L. (eds.) "Discrimination and Low Incomes". New York State Commission Against Discrimination. 1958. Chapter 8, pp. 249–279.

Postwar expansion in the skirt industry led to over 4,000 job openings filled largely by Latin Americans. These newcomers met some problems of exploitation and discrimination. Helfgott reports on the attempts of one union local to provide an educational program designed to overcome these problems and to integrate Puerto Rican workers into all job levels within the industry, and into some union leadership positions as well. Relatively successful, but "a distance still separates the leadership and the newcomers".

Hernandez Alvarez, José. "Return Migration in Puerto Rico," Rio Piedras: Social Science Research Center, University of Puerto Rico, 1964, pp. 60.

An examination of the 1960 Census material on Puerto Ricans 5 years or over found living in Puerto Rico who had been living in the conterminous United States in 1955. Publication of these data will be completed in a forthcoming book.

Illich, I. (Fr.) "Puerto Ricans in New York". Commonweal, 64: 294–297. June 22, 1956.

Points out why it is an error to regard Puerto Rican migrants as analogous to other previous incoming groups. Believes that their differences should be acknowledged and respected.

Imse, Thomas P. "Puerto Ricans in Buffalo". City of Buffalo, Board of Community Relations. 1961. 18 pp.

The conclusions in this survey are based in part on interviews, discussions, and official sources of data; and in part on general impressions. Puerto Ricans lived in several areas of moderate concentration and were experiencing "nothing that could be called a Puerto Rican problem". They did not feel discriminated against. The problems they had were those that migrants to a new culture have—a new language to cope with, low-skill jobs, low income, and unfamiliarity with the ways of the new culture. Urges "careful and thoughtful behavior by the general population" to speed the process of acculturation. Found that a "rapid 'americanization' is taking place" among the Puerto Rican children.

Jahn, A. V. "Spanish Harlem". Today's Health, 31: 30–34. February 1953.

Maintains that most newcomers from Puerto Rico migrate to New York City in search of a better chance for their children. Once in New York, due to some exploitation of them plus low incomes, Puerto Rican families in Spanish Harlem are faced with relatively high rates of health problems associated with slum life—TB, venereal disease, dysentery, malnutrition, etc. In spite of this, the families face their problems with optimistic attitudes.

Jones, Isham B. "The Puerto Rican in New Jersey: His Present Status". New Jersey State Department of Education, Division Against Discrimination. July 1955. 48 pp.

A survey that includes a discussion indicating the location of Puerto Rican migrants in New Jersey. Also presents some of the community reactions to the migrants, noting that though some were positive and helpful many were antagonistic.

King, John "From Caguas to New York." San Juan Review, 2: 62–64. June 1965.

King, executive deputy superintendent of the New York City public school system, presents a descriptive survey of the approaches taken in the New York City schools to enable children of Puerto Rican background "to achieve the highest possible level of personal and social competence." Indicates emphasis placed on mastery of communication skills in English. Also points out the attempts made to help children of Puerto Rican origin maintain and extend their communication skills in Spanish and to expand their "knowledge and appreciation of Puerto Rican history and culture." Advocates more island-mainland visiting by school administrators and classroom teachers.

✓ **Koch, J. E.** "Puerto Ricans Come to Youngstown." Commonweal, 59: 9–11. Oct. 8, 1953.

Describes the efforts made by the Youngstown Puerto Rican Social Recreational Center to enable Puerto Rican migrants become fully participating citizens without subjecting them to the humiliating problems faced by earlier immigrants. The center was established under the auspices of the Community Chest and Catholic Charities after it was learned that Puerto Rican newcomers were being exploited by some landlords and finance companies, and meeting hostility and prejudice from some Youngstown residents. Some racist literature had been circulated.

"Labor Recruited." Business Week, Apr. 29, 1944, pp. 114.

In cooperation with the War Manpower Commission, three large U.S. firms were recruiting skilled Puerto Rican workers for jobs on the mainland as a partial solution to their manpower shortage problems. The commission expected that more workers would be recruited by other firms.

Lee, Robert. "Protestant Churches in the Brooklyn Heights: A Study of Adaptation." Brooklyn: Brooklyn Division of the Protestant Council of New York. 1954.

A survey of how 10 churches approached the questions arising from entry into their neighborhoods of newcomers from Puerto Rico and from the south.

Lelyveld, J. "Se Habla Espanol?" New York Times Magazine, June 14, 1964. pp. 65–66+.

Tens of thousands of Puerto Ricans have learned English in New York City in order to get along better. In response to the Puerto Rican migration, some New Yorkers, though relatively few, have learned Spanish. These merchants, policemen, ministers, teachers et al., who have learned some Spanish and use it, have discovered that this has tended to improve their relationships with Puerto Ricans. Such efforts lead to mutual understanding and increased respect.

Leviton, Bertha. "Census of Puerto Rican and Foreign-born Pupils." New York City Board of Education, Bureau of Administrative and Budgetary Research, February 1956. 29 pp.

Based on school census of Oct. 31, 1955. The most recent report of this type was done by Miss Leviton and published in May 1964. The reports present data on fluency in English, pupils classified NE (non-English speaking), numbers coming from Puerto Rico or born in New York City of Puerto Rican parents, and numbers of foreign born. Data are presented in citywide, boroughwide, and grade-level tables.

Lewis, Oscar. "Mother and Son in Puerto Rican Slum, Part I, Felicita." Harper's, December 1965, pp. 71–84.

Lewis, Oscar, "Portrait of Gabriel: a Puerto Rican Family in San Juan and New York, Part II, Gabriel." Harper's, January 1966, pp. 54–59.

Professor Lewis repeats in Puerto Rico his attention to the "culture of poverty" in the Zolaesque prose which is his hallmark. Great attention was paid to the selection of the most benighted families in Puerto Rico and a sample of those who had relatives in New York City was taken. A concentration of misery was found in San Juan's oldest slum—La Perla (here called La Esmeralda), where a minority of the approximately 900 families "had some history of prostitution." The author chose to select one of these families for intensive dramatization to illustrate "the psychology and inner life of some of the very poor."

The 7-year-old boy's story is appealing, particularly the treatment of his troubles in learning English after he migrated to New York City. His courage comes through with great impact.

It is difficult to understand the author's allusion to "the persistence of a Puerto Rican way of life, especially among the low-income group, even after many years of residence in the United States * * *," since the implication is that the Puerto Ricans differ from other groups in this regard. No evidence is known to the editors to substantiate this position. Also, the statement that "Puerto Ricans made almost a million trips back and forth (in 1960) * * * is misleading when it is used to imply that the Puerto Rican migration is unique in that "it is a two-way rather than a one-way movement." All free migration is a two-way movement. This is particularly true of other internal migrations, e.g., that of the Southern Appalachian Mountaineers.

Lewis, Oscar. "In New York You Get Swallowed by a Horse." Commentary, 38: 69–73. November 1964.

Through the fictionalized conversation between two Puerto Rican friends (one returned from New York City) in a San Juan bar, Lewis interestingly presents the frustrations felt by some Puerto Ricans as they face the problems related to cultural conflicts and low economic status in the complex city of New York. As Lewis says, some Puerto Ricans find New York "the best," others find it too much for them.

Lorge, Irving and Mayans, Frank, Jr. "Vestibule vs. Regular Classes for Puerto Rican Migrant Pupils." Teachers College Record 55: 231–237. February 1954.

Research directed by the authors at the request of the Board of Education of New York City. Done to ascertain whether Puerto Rican children learned English better and adjusted more rapidly when grouped together and separated from other children, or when placed in regular classes with other children. Results favored the regular class setting for both mastery of English and the development of positive relationships with other children. "Despite its possible limitations, the study does suggest that 'stretching' children to understand in the real setting has marked advantages."

Main, Willett S. "Memorandum on 'In-Migration of Puerto Rican Workers,'" Wisconsin State Employment Service, Sept. 3, 1952.

Describes ways in which local offices of the employment service are helpful in speeding up the adjustment process. This memorandum was followed by "In-Migration of Puerto Rican Workers: Progress Report," Dec. 16, 1952, and a collection of English and Spanish materials utilized in the program.

✓ Maldonado, A. W. "The Migration Reverses." The Nation, 198: 255–257. Mar. 16, 1964.

Suggests possible reasons for the decline in annual net migration from Puerto Rico since 1953. Indicates that the decline has a high positive correlation with a relative decline in semiskilled and unskilled job opportunities on the mainland. Also suggests other factors: In general the level of education and training is not sufficient to handle the increasing number of skilled and white collar job opportunities. Some manufacturing plants are leaving New York. Also discusses some of the problems that Puerto Rico must cope with as a result of the decline in net out-migration and the increase in the number of return migrants.

Maldonado, A. W. "The Puerto Rican Tide Begins to Turn." New York Times Magazine, Sept. 20, 1964, pp. 84–85+.

Essentially a restatement of the ideas expressed in "The Migration Reverses." The title is somewhat misleading since Puerto Rican migration is actually a very small part of the annual total internal migration in the United States.

Malzberg, Benjamin. "Mental Disease Among Puerto Ricans in New York City." Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 123: 263–269. March 1956.

After making adjustments for the younger age distribution of Puerto Ricans in New York City relative to the rest of the population, Malzberg discovered a considerably higher annual rate of first admissions to New York City hospitals for mental disturbances among Puerto Ricans than among the rest of the city population. Malzberg concludes that the higher rate is directly related to such difficult problems as language and cultural conflicts, limited occupational choice, and substandard living conditions with which Puerto Ricans are forced to cope. Author reminds the reader that it is not valid to generalize the admission rates for newcomers to the total Puerto Rican population.

McKeon, John. "The Ortiz Family." Jubilee, 1: 22–23. June 1953.

Sketch of a Puerto Rican family that migrated into the new community. The year of publication and the limited evidence presented should be taken into account when considering the following conclusion: "* * * It is doubtful whether any immigrant group, Catholic in culture, tradition and practice, has at any time in our national history faced the contempt and opprobrium that has been the average potion meted the Puerto Rican in his efforts to integrate himself into our society. And far from welcoming the increase to the Faith * * * the reaction of the American Catholic Faith has to date ranged from one of stolid indifference to one of outspoken contempt."

"Mid-Century Pioneers and Protestants. A Survey Report of the Puerto Rican Migration to the United States Mainland and in Particular a Study of Protestant Expression Among the Puerto Ricans of New York City." New York: The Pathfinder Service for the Protestant Churches of New York City and the Division of Home Missions, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., 153, 23 pp.

Contains recommendations for programs to overcome the "less than warm welcome on the part of the older New York churches for their new neighbors."

Miller, Henry. "New York City's Puerto Rican Pupils: A Problem of Acculturation." School and Society, 76: 129–132. Aug. 30, 1952.

Puerto Rican migrants are eager to improve their status and get a good education for their children. They face the problems related to learning a new language and color prejudice against them. Schools cannot solve all of the problems facing the newcomers, but they can assist the acculturation process. In 1952, 80 percent of the public schools in New York City had some Puerto Rican enrollment. Points out some of the procedures instituted in the schools to help newcomers—both pupils and their parents. Suggest that school personnel can be especially helpful when they base their programs on the principle that "acculturation proceeds most successfully when it is based on respect for the dignity and values of the minority."

Mintz, Sidney. "Puerto Rican Emigration: A Threefold Comparison." Social and Economic Studies. Jamaica: University College of the West Indies, v. 4 (December 1955), No. 4, pp. 311–325.

Interesting and suggestive comparisons between Puerto Rican migration to New York City, St. Croix, and Hawaii. Further research is needed to account for differential success noted in these areas.

Monserrat, Joseph. "Literacy Tests: Puerto Rican Perspective." New York Herald Tribune Magazine, Oct. 13, 1963, pp. 9–10+.

The author, chief of the migration division of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, department of labor in New York City, argues that literacy tests have historically been used to deny some persons of their right to vote. Such, he states, is the case now with Puerto Ricans in New York. States that Puerto Ricans do have access to domestic and international news in Spanish, thus those who may not be literate in English can and do become informed on the issues and candidates. Points out the irony involved in the fact that for Puerto Ricans in New York, "tax forms and instructions are available in both English and Spanish, but they can only vote in English."

Monserrat, Joseph. "School Integration: A Puerto Rican View." Address before the Conference on Integration to the New York City Public Schools, Teachers College, Columbia University, May 2, 1963. Included in the conference proceedings published as "Integrating the Urban School," Klopf, G. and Laster, I. (eds.) Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, pp. 45–60.

Distinguishes between the meaning of segregation for Negroes and for Puerto Ricans. Any school that includes only pupils of Puerto Rican origin is racially integrated. Is distressed with the phrases and words used to label children such as "culturally deprived," etc. No matter how well intentioned, the stigmatism results in damaging the children. For whatever reasons, however, Puerto Rican pupils in segregated schools are adversely affected in that their academic achievement is reduced and also feelings of inferiority are generated. Suggests that the positive features of Puerto Rican culture be utilized in the schools of New York City.

Morgan, T. B. "Real West Side Story—Life of José Rivera." Look, 24: 22–27. Feb. 16, 1960.

Points out that in spite of the difficult problems encountered in the slums of New York's West Side, most Puerto Rican young people are not as those portrayed in "West Side Story," a musical and movie. Most are similar to José, struggling against great odds to cope with the problems. Suggests that the slums need to be broken up so as to restore integrity to the lives of people now demoralized by them.

Moskin, J. R. "Million on the Mainland." Look 25: 44. Jan. 17, 1961.

Brief essay on the problems faced by Puerto Rican migrants and the progress they have made, especially in larger cities. Author suggests, but does not provide supporting evidence, that they face more prejudice and hostility in smaller communities. Refers to the increasingly effective social and political organization among the Puerto Ricans on the mainland.

"New AFL-CIO Racket Drive." Business Week, June 29, 1957, pp. 149–150.

A report on the attempts of some mob-run locals that prey on Puerto Rican workers in small shops. Evidence of some shakedowns and "sweetheart" contracts. National AFL-CIO leaders were attempting to expel the racketeers after some of the exploited workers had petitioned the NLRB for a representative election.

New York City Board of Education. "A Program of Education for Puerto Ricans in New York City." New York City Board of Education. 1947.

A report by a Committee of Assistant Superintendents. One of the earliest set of recommendations by New York City Public School officials to develop programs specifically designed to facilitate the acculturation of pupils of Puerto Rican origin. In addition to recommendations, the report includes sections on Puerto Rican backgrounds, "migration to the mainland", "problems of assimilation", and "education of the Puerto Rican pupil".

New York City Board of Education. "Ethnic Distribution of Pupils In The Public Schools of New York City". Published by The Board. Mar. 24, 1965. 17 pp.

A presentation of the data showing the changing ethnic composition and distribution of the public school enrollments in New York City. Negro and Puerto Rican enrollments have increased steadily, both numerically and relatively, since 1958–59, the first year for which citywide data on Negro, Puerto Rican, and "Others" (largely white) are available. The number of "Others" has decreased during the same period. Reflecting these changes, there are now more integrated schools than in 1960. (There are 90 fewer predominantly white schools now), but also 69 more schools predominantly Negro and/or Puerto Rican than in 1960. Suggests a variety of measures that might be taken to provide a more balanced ethnic distribution. Charts, tables and graphs supplement the written presentation.

New York City Board of Education. Bilingual Committee of the Junior High School Division. "Tentative Report of the Committee on Classification." Bullentin No. 1. New York City Board of Education, June 1949.

Contains questionnaires for use with newly-arrived pupils and a bibliography for teachers.

New York City Mayor's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs. "Puerto Rican Pupils in New York City Schools." Published by The Committee, 1951.

A survey of the elementary and junior high schools in which pupils of Puerto Rican origin were registered. Survey made by the subcommittee on Education, Recreation and Parks of the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs.

New York State Commission Against Discrimination. "Complaints Alleging Discrimination Because of Puerto Rican National Origin." Published by The Commission, 1958.

A summary report for the period July 1, 1945 to Sept. 1, 1958.

New York State Commission Against Discrimination. "Employment in the Hotel Industry." Published by The Commission, March, 1958.

A thorough research study of the patterns of discrimination used against various groups including Puerto Ricans. Puerto Ricans had found "extensive employment opportunities in both unskilled and skilled jobs" in New York City's leading hotels. But they were infrequently found in white collar and administrative jobs and most frequently in the behind-the-scene jobs that involved little or no direct contact with hotel guests and the public.

New York State Department of Labor. "Occupations of Puerto Ricans in New York City." Special Labor News Memo No. 50. New York State Department of Labor. June 17, 1954.

A survey, utilizing Department data, of first and second generation Puerto Ricans in New York City compared with the general population in corresponding age groups. Indicates some upward nobility of second generation Puerto Ricans.

Newfield, Jack. "Harlem Si, Tammany No." Commonweal, 75: 10–12. Sept. 29, 1961.

A report on the development of the East Harlem Reform Democratic Club. Anti-Tammany candidate Mark Lane won a State Assembly seat in 1960. Carlos Rios, East Harlem resident, was elected as the first Puerto Rican Democrat Party district leader in New York City. Did so against the opposition of Tammany Hall. The Club attempts to work on problems facing the Puerto Rican residents of "El Banio", a section of East Harlem.

"900,000 Puerto Ricans in U.S.: Their Problems and Progress." U.S. News and World Report, 47: 91–95. Dec. 7, 1959.

Somewhat sensational focus on the problems involving Puerto Rican migrants. Assumes that problems of slum housing, poverty, and crime were being created by the influx of Puerto Ricans. Charges that a crime wave had hit New York involving "many hispanos." Lack supporting data. Points out some signs of progress made by Puerto Ricans. Notes that some of the City agencies had employed Spanish-speaking personnel.

Novak, Robert T. "Distribution of Puerto Ricans on Manhattan Island." Geographical Review, 46: 182–186. April, 1956.

By 1950 New York City had received 83 percent of the Puerto Ricans who had migrated to the mainland. Identifies three major and three minor areas of Puerto Rican concentration in the borough of Manhattan (New York City). Indicates that availability of low cost housing, proximity to a friend or family member who preceded them, and access to cheap public transportation are probably the major reasons that Puerto Ricans move into these six areas.

O'Brien, Robert W. "A Survey of the Puerto Ricans in Lorain, Ohio." Neighborhood House Association of Lorain. 1954. 85 pp.

A field survey done in 1953 by college students under the careful direction of O'Brien and other faculty members of the Department of Sociology, Ohio Wesleyan University. Migration to Lorain began in 1947 with 500 workers recruited by the National Tube Company. 3707 persons of Puerto Rican origin by 1953. The survey is a comprehensive demographic study of these migrants plus their backgrounds in Puerto Rico, aspirations, problems and progress made. The data reveal the migration to have been a family movement rather than one of unrelated individuals. Some problems with housing, some discrimination in employment, inadequate recreational facilities, a language barrier, general discrimination, and in the non-Puerto Rican community some lack of "know-how" in assisting newcomers. However, author concludes that the adjustment of Puerto Ricans in Lorain "has been both rapid and sound".

O'Brien, Robert W. "Hawaii's Puerto Ricans: Stereotype and Reality." Social Process in Hawaii, 23: 61–64. 1959. University of Hawaii.

Early migration from Puerto Rico to Hawaii. Sugar plantation owners recruited nearly 5,000 during 1900–01. A population nearly 10,000 by 1950. An interview survey of a sample of first and second generation Puerto Ricans in Hawaii coupled with other research data led to the following conclusions: A majority of the Puerto Ricans lived in rural and plantation areas, they were over-represented in low-skilled and laborer occupations, had not effectively utilized the educational system (67 percent of those over age 25 had a sixth grade education or less), were over-represented in arrests, divorces, criminal and juvenile court cases (supporting data were not provided for this conclusion), lacked a positive group identification. However, the non-Puerto Rican community was gradually recognizing the achievement of many Puerto Ricans in a number of areas. Also, signs of new Puerto Rican leadership and self-organization were appearing.

O'Gara, J. "Strangers in the City." Commonweal, 57: 7–9. Oct. 10, 1952.

A general discussion of the problems that Puerto Ricans encounter in New York City—color prejudice, poor living areas, the bottom range of the economic and employment ladders, some loss of status by males when the women get better jobs (such as in the garment industry), cultural transition from a slower paced Puerto Rican society to the hectic, urban society in New York. Points out that many agencies and groups were attempting to help them cope with the problems. Also, notes the programs for pupils of Puerto Rican origin instituted by the Board of Education.

O'Neill, George C. and O'Neill, Nena. "Vocational Rehabilitation Needs of Disabled Puerto Ricans in New York City." Puerto Rican Social Services, Inc. 1964. 118 pp.

A pilot research project carried out under a grant from the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It was designed "to derive hypotheses for further testing or to develop research strategy and priorities." Persons of Puerto Rican origin or who are bilingual carried out the field work. A final sample of 60 persons was studied. Conclusions are: disabled Puerto Ricans need direct assistance from agency personnel who are bilingual and who take a personal interest in the problems they encounter during rehabilitation. High motivation was found among disabled Puerto Ricans during their rehabilitation. They complete "rehabilitation with the same success as non-Puerto Ricans."

Opler, Marvin K. "Dilemmas of Two Puerto Rican Men." In Seward G. (ed.). "Clinical Studies in Culture Conflict." The Ronald Press Co., 1958. Chapter 10, pp. 223–244.

Stresses the importance of male dominance in most social activity in the traditional, rural culture of Puerto Rico. Urban life challenges this value and tends to weaken the male role leading to some personal and family problems—economic, social, and psychological. The essay analyzes from a Freudian point of view, some of these problems as seen in two Puerto Rican young men adversely affected by culture conflicts—one in San Juan, the other in New York City. Concludes, without presenting supporting data, that "these cases appear to be 'typical' among Puerto Ricans."

"Out of the Melting Pot." Economist, 211: 273. April, 1964.

A brief account pointing out some of the gains made by second generation Puerto Ricans in New York—especially in education, types of occupations, and income. Females seem to be improving their status faster than males. Some Puerto Rican leaders point out, however, that the situation is not as desirable as it may seem. Employment, income and education levels are still very low and below those of the non-Puerto Rican population—both white and nonwhite. The leaders seek changes in the educational system. Among other things, they want "Spanish-speaking teachers, compulsory kindergarten, instruction in Puerto Rican history and abolition of vocational high schools."

Pagán de Colón, Petroamérica. "The Status of the Migrant: People With the Same Aspirations." Vital Speeches, 28: 445–448. May 1, 1962.

Utilizing the basic findings of a study by Clarence Senior done for the American Society of Planning Officials, the author points out that all voluntary migration is related to desires for economic and social improvement, and presents some problems—economic, social pressures (among the unaffluent migrants) and in the area of human relationships. Believes that fear of strangers is at the root of the problems. The author believes that the ongoing efforts in human relations and the civil rights action on the mainland, coupled with the work of the Commonwealth in better preparing migrants for the new environment they will enter will lead the settled residents to welcome the newcomers. Believes that future Puerto Rican migrants will increasingly be "more affluent and less visible."

Pakter, Jean; Rosner, H.; Jacobziner, H.; and Greenstein, F. "Out-of-Wedlock Births in New York City." American Journal of Public Health, 51: 683–696, No. 5. May, 1961. Concluded in vol. 51: 846–865, No. 6. June 1961.

A thorough and well-documented study of out-of-wedlock births. Social and medical data are included. Data for non-Puerto Rican, white, nonwhite, and Puerto Rican are included. The rates for all groups are highly related to conditions of poverty. Puerto Rican out-of-wedlock births are only slightly over-represented (Puerto Rican mothers represent 13.6 percent of the total births and about 20 percent of those out-of-wedlock). "The belief that unmarried women on welfare rolls repeat the pregnancy in order to obtain additional grants is erroneous." In addition, "the Puerto Rican unmarried mother was the most likely and the white unmarried least likely to keep and raise her own child". All groups need community assistance to cope with the medical and social problems associated with out-of-wedlock births.

Parker, E. C. "Spanish-Speaking Churches." Christian Century 78: 466–468. Apr. 12, 1961. Also, Cotto-Thomm, A. "Spanish-Speaking: A Reply." Christian Century, 78: 801. June 28, 1961.

A discussion of the controversy about the effectiveness of the Protestant Council of New York City in meeting the needs of Spanish-speaking Protestants in New York City. One group of Spanish-speaking ministers charging the council with disinterest in Spanish-speaking Protestants and lack of concern for "morality," broke away from the council to form a separate organization. They advocated private schools for Puerto Rican children in New York City that would be taught in Spanish, emphasize morality, and develop pride in being Puerto Rican. Some council leaders agreed that the council had not been as effective as it should have been in working with the Puerto Ricans, but believed that a vigorous program would now be developed. Cotto-Thomm asserts that the leaders of the new, separate organization are not the spokesmen for all of the Spanish-speaking Protestant ministers and laymen in the city. He believes the new organization would divide Puerto Ricans rather than unite them.

"Philadelphia's Puerto Rican Population With 1960 Census Data." City of Philadelphia, Commission on Human Relations. March 1964.

A comprehensive descriptive survey of the characteristics of population of Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia. Comparisons of Puerto Ricans with both the white and nonwhite population groups. Though the Puerto Rican newcomers were having problems associated with low family incomes it was "concluded that those Puerto Ricans residing outside the area of greatest Puerto Rican concentration are on the average in a higher socioeconomic bracket. Thus the Puerto Rican migrants are following the pattern of many ethnic groups before them who scattered about the city as they were able to better themselves." The report includes tables and some description of the organizations and agencies providing services available to Puerto Ricans, and others.

"Plea For The Puerto Ricans." Social Science Review, 26: 344. September 1952.

Puerto Ricans, taking an evening course in a New York settlement house, recommend several labor practices that would enable employers to receive increased productivity from Puerto Rican workers: end discriminating practices, treat Puerto Rican workers as individuals rather than as a group, train Puerto Ricans for skilled work, employ some Spanish-speaking foremen. Also, suggested that employers should learn some Spanish.

Protestant Council of the City of New York. "A Report on the Protestant Spanish Community in New York City." Published by the council's department of church planning and research. July 1960. 138 pp.

This report supplements and brings up to date three earlier reports published either by the council or its forerunner, the Greater New York Federation of Churches. The earliest report, "The Puerto Ricans in New York," was published in 1938. In 1947, "The Protestant Church and Puerto Ricans in New York City" was published, followed by "Mid-Century Pioneers and Protestants" in 1953. The most recent report is considered as the first section of a more comprehensive study. The report includes the population data on Puerto Ricans for the city as a whole and on a borough-by-borough basis. It provides historical and contemporary sketches of the approaches to Puerto Rican migrants and other Spanish-speaking groups taken by the various Protestant denominations. Data are included on the number of Protestant churches ministering to Puerto Ricans, size of church membership, types of programs developed by the churches (i.e. youth projects, English classes, Spanish classes, housing clinics, social and medical services, etc.), and names and addresses of the churches. Points out that New York City Protestantism had expanded its efforts to minister to Spanish-speaking persons during the decade prior to this report. Notes that "as official policies become implemented on a local level practical problems arise and the transition from verbal resolution to everyday reality is often difficult, demanding great patience, and a willingness to experiment." One Protestant leader charged that Protestant agencies "have not been very imaginative in devising ways for the Puerto Rican to feel wanted and at home in our ecclesiastical structure."

Public Education Association. "The Status of the Public School Education of Negro and Puerto Rican Children in New York City." Public Education Association (New York City). 1955.

Based upon a survey of the city school system. Concluded that schools with pupil enrollments largely Negro and/or Puerto Rican tended to be inferior in physical facilities, professional staff, and pupil achievement. Recommended changes designed to correct these deficiencies.

"Puerto Ricans and the ILGWU." New Politics 1: 6–17, 1962. 2: 7–27, 1963.

In these articles Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the NAACP, charged the ILGWU with discriminating against Negroes and Puerto Ricans in all phases of the union's activities. Gus Tyler, of the ILGWU, defends the union and presents data intended to refute each charge made by Hill. More supporting data for both the charges and the defense are needed for the average reader to reach a valid conclusion.

"Puerto Rican Community Development Project." Puerto Rican Forum (New York). 1964. 145 pp.

This report was developed as the basis for an antipoverty, economic opportunity project, and is subtitled "A Proposal for a Self-Help Project To Develop the Community by Strengthening the Family, Opening Opportunities for Youth and Making Full Use of Education." The forum is a private agency, with a professional and secretarial staff of New Yorkers of Puerto Rican background. It has received some financial support from foundations to develop self-help projects as well as some public money to develop its proposal. Thus the concern in this report is to highlight the problems—income, housing, education, family, etc.—that confront the Puerto Rican community in New York City, though not all of its population. Data are presented to support the thesis that Puerto Ricans generally are not well off and need to make much more rapid gains in a contemporary technical, urban society such as New York. As a forum summary indicates, the report is advanced as a rationale for a project "which takes into consideration both the problems of poverty in New York City and the complex realities of the cultural community pattern of the Puerto Rican New Yorker." The report is not intended to be a rounded picture of the total Puerto Rican population in New York City. Read from the point of view of its purpose it is an illuminating study.

"Puerto Ricans in New York City." Geographical Review, 44: 143–144. January 1954.

A brief essay that includes several unsubstantiated assumptions: i.e., that Puerto Ricans migrate as the result of a population push in Puerto Rico; that Puerto Ricans are immigrants; that many Puerto Ricans are slow to Americanize out of a fear of submergence into the American Negro world; and, that by nonassimilation they can maintain a higher status than Negroes. An interesting essay that needs to be carefully read.

"Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia." Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations. April 1959. 39 pp. Prepared by Raymond Metauten and Burton Gordon.

Philadelphia had early experienced migration from Puerto Rico. By 1958 there were 20,000 Puerto Ricans living there. As early as 1953 the private and public agencies in Philadelphia were attempting to gear some of their programs to the needs of the newcomers. This study interprets the problems of and the significant progress made by the migrants in Philadelphia. The following paragraph from the foreword to the report accurately indicates the contents: "The first part of the report contains general background information about Puerto Ricans, their history, their recent migration to the U.S. mainland and brief comments about New York City's Puerto Rican population. The bulk of the report describes the characteristics, size, location, and problems of the Puerto Rican population in Philadelphia. Some of the principal services and facilities concerned with the needs and problems of Puerto Ricans are also described."

"Puerto Ricans in the United States." U.S. Census of Population: 1950. IV. Special Reports, chapter D, 18 pp.

Data similar to those in item immediately below, from 1950 census.

"Puerto Ricans in the United States." U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Final Report PC(2)–1D. U.S. Census of Population: 1960 July 1963. III–XIV and 104 pp.

A detailed report which "presents statistics from the 1960 Census of Population on the social and economic characteristics of persons of Puerto Rican parentage in the United States, for the country as a whole and for selected areas." The outstanding and most complete source of reliable data on those Puerto Ricans in the United States in 1959 and 1960. It is still a useful document.

"Puerto Ricans Not Guilty." Economist, 193: 44+. Oct. 3, 1959.

A brief commentary on the problems Puerto Ricans face on the mainland—color prejudice, poor housing, low income, unskilled jobs, and delinquency. A New York City judge had stated that Puerto Ricans were greatly over-represented in delinquency and crime, and suggested that city officials should discourage them from coming to New York. Examination of available data demonstrated that Puerto Rican youth were not disproportionately involved in delinquency, and that the Puerto Ricans were generally law-abiding citizens.

Raushenbush, Winifred. "New York and The Puerto Ricans." Harper, 206: 13–15, 78+. May 1953.

Describes the shocks that Puerto Rican migrants face in New York City—housing and employment discrimination, color prejudice, and bad relations between the newcomers and police in East Harlem. However, the author believes that Puerto Ricans are optimistic about their future—pointing to improvements in race relations plus their mobility within the city as reasons for the optimism.

Rosten, Norman. "Puerto Ricans in New York." Holiday, 29: 48–49+. February 1961.

A cursory examination of the problems and progress among Puerto Rican migrants. Compares them favorably with immigrants of an earlier era. Points out that Puerto Ricans did not create the problems of urban life. They found them here when they arrived. Says they are dismayed by their treatment as second-class citizens, and will not accept such status.

Robinson, Sophia. "Can Delinquency Be Measured." Columbia University Press. 1936. See pp. 236–249.

This section is a discussion of a group of Puerto Rican children. Illustrative of fundamental considerations this field of research and social action.

Ruiz, Paquita. "Vocational Needs of Puerto Rican Migrants." University of Puerto Rico, Social Science Research Center. 1947. 84 pp.

A research study that includes an investigation of the vocational, social, and educational needs of 3,024 male Puerto Ricans who had migrated to New York City during the years 1940–44. Pointed out several vocational needs of these men that might be met prior to migration—industrial training, higher level of education, improved English literacy, and vocational guidance.

Samuels, Gertrude. " I Don't Think the Cop Is My Friend." New York Times magazine, Mar. 29, 1964, p. 28+.

A human interest account of the problems of human relations said to exist between police and Puerto Ricans on Manhattan's Upper West Side. In light of the insufficient evidence provided in the article to support the title's contention, it does not seem valid to conclude that most Puerto Ricans dislike most police. However, Samuels does point out the kinds of grievances that some police and some Puerto Ricans have against each other. States that some progress is being made in the area between the two groups. Suggests the need for more Spanish-speaking police, and more social work and psychological education in the police academy.

Samuels, Gertrude. "Two Case Histories Out of Puerto Rico." New York Times magazine, Jan. 22, 1956, pp. 26–27+.

A journalistic account of two Puerto Rican families migrating to New York City. Details quickly the problems encountered as migrants—humiliation, some family strains, difficulty for the male jobseeker, low income, etc. Both families migrated in search of a better chance in life; as one family put it, "for the future of the children." The author briefly describes the work of the Migration Division of the Department of Labor (Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) both in New York City and in Puerto Rico as the Division seeks to orient and help the migrants before they leave Puerto Rico and upon arrival on the mainland. The two cases are not assumed to be representative of the total group of migrants.

San Juan. Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. "Characteristics of Passengers Who Travel by Air Between Puerto Rico and the United States." Published by the Department of Labor. 1956 and following years.

A series of quarterly and annual reports of statistical data. The series has been discontinued by the Department in as much as the technique and procedures used to make the surveys at the airport may not have yielded reliable and valid data. However, the earlier reports do provide the careful researcher with clues to migration trends.

Sauna, Victor, D., et al. "The Vocational Rehabilitation Problems of Disabled Puerto Ricans in New York City". The Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University—Bellevue Medical Center. Rehabilitation monograph XII. 1957.

In addition to the problems that most disabled persons encounter during rehabilitation, Puerto Ricans have a major problem of communication. Points out that agency personnel were as aware of this problem as the Puerto Rican disabled persons. A valuable examination of popular conceptions (and misconceptions) about reaction to pain, educability, ambition, etc., among Puerto Ricans.

Sayers, Raymond. "New York Teachers in Puerto Rican Schools". High Points 39: 5–16. November 1957.

A helpful account of the author's experiences in Puerto Rico as a participant in the Puerto Rico Department of Education's teacher-exchange program.

Schepses, Edwin. "Puerto Rican Delinquent Boys in New York City". "Social Service Review" 23: 51–56. March 1949.

A comparison of first and second generation Puerto Rican boys in Warwick "training school" with those of other groups. "Puerto Rican delinquency, on the whole, is of a milder type." Puerto Rican boys born in New York City are found in a slightly higher proportion in Warwick (2 to 3 percentage points) than are those born in Puerto Rico.

Schmitzler, W. F. "Puerto Rican Workers Get Labor's Help to the Better Life." American Federationist, 67: 6–7. February 1960.

Brief article indicating that the labor movement is trying to break the racket organizations which had exploited Puerto Rican workers. Also, suggests that more aggressive collective bargaining by legitimate labor unions are bringing higher wages and better working conditions. Refers to the labor skills and productive capacity that most Puerto Ricans have.

Seda Bonilla, Edwin. "Patrones de Acómodo del Emigrante Puertorriqueño a la Estructura Social Norteamericana." Revista de Ciencias Sociales. Vol. II (Junio 1958) num. 2. pp. 189–200.

Essay on the difficulties encountered by Puerto Ricans moving to the metropolis from an environment in which race does not have the deleterious consequences which it has in New York City. The analysis of Mills et al., is upheld.

Senior, Clarence. "Migration and Puerto Rico's Population Problem." The Annals, 285: 130–136. January 1953.

Interprets the significance of much data on the nature of the Puerto Rican migration. Indicates that migration was helping to reduce population pressures in Puerto Rico. Raised questions regarding the long-range effects migration would have on the economy and total Puerto Rican society. Contains a table of annual migration as a percentage of natural increase in Puerto Rico's population, 1942–51.

Senior, Clarence. "Migration to the Mainland." Monthly Labor Review 78: 1354–1358. December 1955.

One of several articles written by Senior during the late 1940's and the 1950's that deal with this subject. Supporting evidence is provided for the thesis that Puerto Rican migration is directly related to the employment opportunities on the mainland. More Puerto Ricans migrate than return to Puerto Rico during periods of high employment. During periods of depression or recession few migrate and many on the mainland return. Senior cites the two streams of migration from Puerto Rico—farm laborers and urban settlers. Describes the farm laborer contract program begun in 1947 with mainland farmers in need of seasonal labor. The program has been carefully enforced by Puerto Rican officials since its inception. Includes an account of the extensive work carried out both in Puerto Rico and on the mainland by the Migration Division of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor.

Senior, Clarence. "Puerto Rican Dispersion in the United States." Social Problems, 2: 93–99. October 1954.

A discussion of the factors related to dispersion of the Puerto Rican population on the mainland. Though considerable concentration in New York City, there is dispersal into many areas of the United States. Includes data.

Senior, Clarence. "Puerto Ricans on the Mainland." Americas, 13: 36–47. August 1961.

In article form the author presents the themes of his book "Strangers—Then Neighbors" (now revised under the title "The Puerto Ricans—Strangers Then Neighbors." Quadrangle Press, 1965), Freedom Books, 1961. See annotation of the revised edition in section II of this bibliography.

✓ Senior, Clarence. "Research on the Puerto Rican Family in the United States." Marriage and Family Living, 19: 32–37. February 1957.

An account of the problems involved in trying to reach valid conclusions regarding Puerto Rican migrant families. Need much more research on the demographic transition of these families, skin color as a factor in the family's adjustment on the mainland, and the family strains related to culture conflict. Suggests that cross-cultural studies be made.

Senior, Clarence. "The Puerto Ricans in the United States." In Joseph Gittler (ed.). Understanding Minority Groups. John Wiley, 1956. Ch. VII. Pp. 109–125.

A survey of the material on Puerto Ricans. Analysis of statistical data is included.

Shotwell, Louisa. "Puerto Rican Neighbors." The Presbyterian Tribune, 68: 1–3. September 1953.

A positive, human interest account of Puerto Rican newcomers and the need for "neighborliness" on the part of the receiving communities. Some general suggestions for Protestant congregations including one to adapt "the parish program to neighborhood needs. * * * Most important of all * * * is a cultivation within the congregation of an attitude of acceptance of the Puerto Ricans as human beings of essential dignity and good will."

✓Siegel, Arthur; Orlans, Harold; and Greer, Loyal. "Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia: A Study of Their Demographic Characteristics, Problems, and Attitudes." Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations. April 1954. 135 pp.

Still one of the few scientific surveys made of Puerto Rican migrants living outside New York City. An excellent source of reliable data.

Simmons, W. R. and Associates. "The Spanish-Speaking Scene: Silhouette on New York City Today." El Diario—La Prensa. February 1963. 60 pp.

A market research study done by Simmons and Associates for El Diario—La Prensa of the publisher's reading audience. A sample of 1,039 "Spanish-speaking persons 15 years of age and over in separate household throughout New York City" was used. Indicates that 1,045,000 Spanish-speaking persons living in the city, 725,000 of them being Puerto Rican. Shows an average family income of $4,472 per year. Suggests that "continuous surveys (of Puerto Rican migrants) show that the migrant * * * is a cut above the average Puerto Rican (on the island) in education and skills." An interesting account of buying habits, ownership of appliances, occupation, employment, etc. Includes data in charts, graphs, and tables.

Slaiman, Donald. "Discrimination and Low Incomes." American Federationist, 68: 17–19. January 1961.

A summary of the types of discrimination in employment which Negroes and Puerto Ricans face in New York as reported originally in studies made by the New York State Commission Against Discrimination and the New School for Social Research. Believes the major responsibility for removing roadblocks resulting from discrimination lies with government officials at all levels. However, calls on business, labor, government, and citizens of minority groups themselves to take action on the problems.

Smart, Pearl. "Experiment in Boston; Services to Puerto Rican Newcomers." Wilson Library Bulletin, 34: 415. February 1960.

Brief account of an effective program developed by a Boston Library designed to teach English to Puerto Rican adults. Other library facilities are now being utilized by a number of Puerto Ricans who had not done so previously.

"State of Birth." U.S. Census of Population, 1950. Special Report, PE No. 4A. 1953. 108 pp.

Gives 1950 census data on Puerto Rican-born persons with age, color, sex, and State of residence.

Strell, Joseph. "Elementary School Principals Visit Puerto Rico." High Points 47: 69–71. February 1965.

During 1963–64 50 New York City elementary school principals and some superintendents visited Puerto Rico. This brief article summarizes the general belief of the New York educators that the "visits were investments in good will. Stereotypes were shattered." The educators were impressed with the high quality of education in Puerto Rico. They felt that the visits had helped them reach a new understanding. "On our return, we saw our children and their parents in a new light. Barriers were broken * * *." Several suggestions for schools and teachers. Raises some important, unanswered questions.

String, Alvin. "Puerto Ricans in New Jersey." Public Health News, August 1962.

A description of the Puerto Rican farm labor program cooperatively developed in New Jersey between farmers and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Indicates some of the problems encountered by the migrant workers and the farmers, and steps being taken by farmers and the Migration Division of the Commonwealth's Department of Labor to overcome the problems. Points out the advantages of the program to both the farmers and the migrant farm laborers.

Stuart, Irving R. "Intergroup Relations and Acceptance of Puerto Ricans and Negroes in an Immigrants' Industry." Journal of Social Psychology, 56: 89–96. 1962.

One of several reports by Stuart based on a research study of the garment industry. Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the ladies garment industry now occupy the low skilled and unskilled positions occupied by the immigrants at the turn of this century. However, Negroes were found to have proportionately a somewhat greater number of the bottom-rank jobs than Puerto Ricans. The newcomers are kept in their subordinate positions by the original workers who are now oldtimers and control the industry plus some apparent unwillingness on the part of the newcomers to compete. Asserts that the ILGWU has encouraged the newcomers to enter training programs for higher skills and improved job opportunities. Says this encouragement has not yet been very effective.

Stuart, Iriving R. "Minorities vs. Minorities: Cognitive, Affective and Conative Components of Puerto Rican and Negro Acceptance and Rejection." The Journal of Social Psychology, 59: 93–99. February 1963.

One of several reports by Stuart based on research in the ladies garment industry. Found considerable animosity between the newcomers to the industry (Negroes and Puerto Ricans) and the oldtimers. The oldtimers tended to feel anxiety over the economic competition from the newcomers. The grievance records illustrated how the Negroes and Puerto Ricans were negatively perceived, i.e., "immoral," "devious," "sly," "combative," "deceitful," etc. The newcomers deeply resented these attitudes of rejection held by the oldtimers—themselves the members of a minority group.

Suchman, Edward A. "Sociomedical Variations Among Ethnic Groups." American Journal of Sociology, 70: 319–331. November 1964.

This research study found that compared with persons of other groups, Puerto Ricans were more suspicious of scientific medical care. They tended to utilize general health services less, and have more limited health horizons.

Talerico, Marguerite, and Brown, Fred. "Intelligence Test Patterns of Puerto Rican Children Seen in Child Psychiatry." The Journal of Social Psychology, 61: 57–66. October 1963.

An examination of the test results on the WISC of 92 Puerto Rican children, ages 6–15, seen in the psychiatric department of a New York City hospital between 1952 and 1961. Though a wide range of intelligence was observed, the tendency was to "dull normal intelligence." Suggests research to determine what factors are operating to bring about this pattern among these and other Puerto Rican children previously studied, most of whom have been from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Data and tables are included.

"Tropics in New York." Americas, 4: 32–33. June 1952.

A journalistic account of Spanish Harlem that highlights the sensational and overromanticizes "El Barrio."

Vandow, Jules E. "Venereal Disease Among Puerto Ricans in New York City." Public Health Reports 70: 1242–1246. December 1955.

Report of a statistical analysis of the incidence of venereal disease among Puerto Ricans done for the New York City Health Department, Division of Social Hygiene. Data are reported, but the most important conclusion was that it is very difficult to draw accurate conclusions from morbidity data about the rate of syphilis for Puerto Ricans.

Vasquez Calzada, José L. "La Emiración Puertorriqueña: ¿Solución o Problema?" Revista de Ciencias Sociales. Vol. VII (December 1963), núm. 4, pp. 323–332.

The out-migration should never have been viewed as anything more than a temporary relief for problems of population pressure. Now that migration balances are toward Puerto Rico the situation of overpopulation must be faced. However, author contends that what is really happening is that there is no net return flow of Puerto Ricans, but an inflow of continental U.S. citizens which gives the impression that there is a return flow of former migrants. Thus far, in any case, this case does not seem to be demonstrated.

Wakefield, Dan. "The Other Puerto Ricans." New York Times Magazine, Oct. 11, 1959, pp. 24–25+.

Because the problems involving some Puerto Ricans have been publicly highlighted, most New Yorkers know little about the many Puerto Rican newcomers who, on their own and in organized groups, are helping other persons. Describes one such woman on Manhattan's Lower East Side who formed a club to help people of Irish, Jewish, and Puerto Rican backgrounds get together.

Wakefield, Dan. "200,000 New Yorkers Can't Vote." Nation, 188: 183–185. Feb. 28, 1959.

A discussion of the controversy over New York State's English-literacy requirement for voting. A law suit on behalf of a citizen of Puerto Rican origin precipitated the controversy. The State courts ruled against him. Stated that resentment among Puerto Ricans against the requirement was increasing. Advocated amending the law to make eligible for voting those literate in Spanish. Many Puerto Ricans felt the law probably would not be changed.

Wagner, Geoffrey. "Puerto Rico in Harlem." New Republic, 131: 16–18. Aug. 23, 1954.

By focusing on an experience he had in Spanish Harlem, the author presents a picture of the positive features found among Puerto Rican New Yorkers. Believes that the Puerto Rican culture brought to New York has enriched the city.

Welfare and Health Council of New York City. "Population of Puerto Rican Birth or Parentage, New York City: 1950." Published by the council. September 1952. 57 pp.

Contains special tabulations of the 1950 U.S. Census of Population. This report, done by the Research Bureau of the Welfare and Health Council, made available the data on the Puerto Rican population for boroughs, health areas, and census tracts. This pamphlet, together with the council's mimeographed bulletin titled "Estimated Net In-Migration to Continental United States From Puerto Rico" (1939–June 1952), gave the most complete and accurate picture available of Puerto Ricans in New York City. Includes maps.

Welfare Council of New York City. "Puerto Ricans in New York City." The Welfare Council. 1948. 60 pp.

A report of the council's Committee on Puerto Ricans in New York City. The survey includes data on the size and locations of the Puerto Rican population; the problems of neighborhood groups of Puerto Rican citizens; education, employment, and health; use of Spanish-speaking personnel in social agencies; and migration and resettlement. The committee recommended ways to reduce the language barrier, the development of special programs within the school system to meet the needs of Puerto Rican pupils, the development of tenant-landlord associations, and a Federal office to deal with Puerto Rican migration. Above all, the committee hoped for a continued increase in mutual understanding between Puerto Ricans and other New Yorkers.

Welfare and Health Council of New York City: Brooklyn Council for Social Planning. "Report on Survey of Brooklyn Agencies Rendering Services to Puerto Ricans." June 1953. 23 pp.

Based on a field study of 89 agencies working in Brooklyn where there were "considerable numbers of Puerto Ricans." Sixty-four agencies cooperated in the study by providing information regarding their programs. Forty-three were rendering services to Puerto Ricans. Twenty-one were not. The survey revealed that only four agencies listed family relations first among "diffculties encountered by Puerto Ricans." Only 12 others considered this even a problem area. Problems with language and housing were regarded as the major difficulties which Puerto Ricans were meeting. The agencies indicated little difficulty in working with Puerto Ricans. Ten agencies said they had none.

Werner, M. R. "The Puerto Ricans: Slum to Slum". Reporter, Sept. 12, 1950, pp. 20–22, and Sept. 26, 1950, pp. 20–23.

A two-part essay that focuses on the problems which Puerto Ricans face upon entering New York City—including the prejudices and resentment of many persons in the receiving community. Indicates that there has been an oversensationalistic coverage of Puerto Ricans by some of the press. Suggests that "planned migration", involvement of Puerto Ricans in the labor unions, and increasing Puerto Rican migration to other countries would help resolve the problems in Puerto Rico and on the U.S. mainland. Does not seem to understand fully the meaning for Puerto Ricans of their full citizenship status.

Wheeler, Helen. "The Puerto Rican Population of New York, New York". Sociology and Social Research, 35: 123–127. November 1950.

Suggests several reasons why Puerto Ricans migrate to New York City—easy and inexpensive transportation; relatively high wages; belief that there is a higher standard of living in the city; influenced by relatives already in New York, and, at times, a low standard of living in Puerto Rico. The essay combines a "push-pull" theory of migration, but emphasizes the "pull".

Woodbury, Clarence. "Our Worst Slum, New York's Spanish Harlem". American Magazine, 148: 30–31+. September 1949.

Cites economic factors as significant rather than political ones in the migration to New York City. Says, without supporting evidence provided, that Spanish Harlem has become United States worst slum. Describes problems related to poverty and discrimination faced by the Puerto Rican migrants. Refers to a program proposed by them—Representative Jacob Javits designed to improve conditions for them. Cites activity that had been undertaken by various groups intended to help. Political reform, better housing, improved

sanitation, etc., needed to "eliminate America's worst slum". This exaggerated account of living conditions, crime, and vice in East Harlem incorrectly assumed the neighborhood a potential breeding ground for communism.

"World They Never Made, New York's Puerto Ricans". Time, 55: 24–26, June 12, 1950.

Basically an essay based on the "Columbia study" ("The Puerto Rican Journey," Mills, C. Wright; Senior, Clarence; Goldsen, Rose. Harper & Bros., 1950. 238 pp. See annotation in sec. II of this bibliography).

Yezierska, Anzia. "Lower Depths of Upper Broadway". Reporter 10: 26–29. Jan. 19, 1954.

An enlightening account of ways that some landlords in New York City exploited Puerto Rican newcomers in search of housing. Based on the author's experiences in a rent-decontrolled building in Manhattan that catered to Puerto Ricans and other minority groups.

Yinger, J. M., and Simpson, G. E. "Integration of Americans of Mexican, Puerto Rican and Oriental Descent". The Annals, 304: 124–131. March 1956.

The brief section on Puerto Ricans is a secondary account derived from a variety of studies and reports. Notes various school programs developed in New York City to maintain cultural pluralism. Suggests that differential assimilation of Puerto Ricans is influenced by employment, sex, education, age, and color.

SECTION II. BOOKS

Berle, Beatrice B. "80 Puerto Rican Families in New York City". Columbia University Press, 1958. 331 pp.

An intensive study of health and related problems of 80 Puerto Rican families living in a New York City slum. This group of families is not a sample of the general Puerto Rican population in New York City. It is a sample of some families with problems of sickness. Many of the problems were related to chronic anxiety and frustration that seemed to result "where the discrepancy between an individual's aspirations and the limited employment opportunities open to him due to lack of schooling or special skill cannot be reconciled" (p. 206).

Burma, John H. "Spanish-Speaking Groups in the United States". Duke University Press, 1954. 214 pp.

Includes a thumbnail sketch of "the Puerto Ricans in New York" (pp. 156–187). Burma assumes that there is a fundamental "unity of culture" among diverse groups put together because they speak the same language. In light of the widely differing historical backgrounds which have given rise to different cultures among Spanish-speaking groups the assumption does not seem valid. It did not include the most reliable and recent sources of data available at the time.

Caplovitz, David, et al. "The Poor Pay More". Free Press, 1963. 220 pp. *

section

This book grew out of a "report on the consumer behavior of families living in four low-income public housing projects in New York City." Carefully researched, the study documents the many ways that low-income families, as consumers, are exploited by some unscrupulous salesmen, merchants, and loan sharks. In addition, the study found that "the families who encounter severe consumer difficulties are not apt to have the knowledge or resources to cope with their difficulties". Concluded that Negro and Puerto Rican families tended to encounter more difficulties as consumers than other families studied. The data suggested that "ethnicity of Negroes and Puerto Ricans is penalized in the marketplace". Outlined an extensive consumer education program for low-income consumers.

Chenault, Lawrence. "The Puerto Rican Migrant in New York City." Columbia University Press, 1938. 190 pp.

The one book that puts together data available on the early movements to New York City of Puerto Rican migrants. Includes a discussion of the various ways these movements affect the established community and the migrants.

Cifre de Loubriel, Estela. "La immigración a Puerto Rico durante el siglo XIX." San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1964. 438 pp.

Dworkis, Martin. "Impact of Puerto Rican Migration on Governmental Services in New York City." New York University Press, 1957. 74 pp.

Under the direction of Professor Dworkis, graduate students in public administration at New York University gathered the data included in this report. The book includes brief chapters on housing, employment, welfare, education, health and hospital services, and crime and delinquency. The data are usually presented with a minimum of interpretation. However, analysis is spotty and contains some unsubstantiated assumptions and conclusions. To cite just one, the discussion on crime and delinquency includes a comment that begins, "the emotional instability of many Puerto Rican youths * * *" yet, "emotional instability" and "many" remain undefined and not supported by evidence.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. (Fr.). "Intermarriage of Puerto Ricans in New York City." The American Journal of Sociology, vol. LXXI, No. 4, January 1966, pp. 395–406.

A study of out-group marriages of Puerto Ricans, based on all marriages in which one partner was first- or second-generation Puerto Rican, indicates that assimilation is taking place rapidly. Increases in the rate of out-group marriage among second-generation as compared with first-generation Puerto Ricans in 1949 and 1959 were as great as those found by Drachsler for all immigrants in New York, 1908–12. Out-group marriage was positively correlated with higher occupational status only in the case of brides. Age at marriage drops in second generation. Civil and Catholic ceremonies drop in New York in contrast to Puerto Rica; Protestant ceremonies increase. Catholic ceremonies increased in 1959 over 1949 and in second generation over first.

Handlin, Oscar. "The Newcomers: Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis." Harvard University Press, 1959. 171 pp.

One of the series of books that grew out of the New York metropolitan region study done under the auspices of the Regional Plan Association. This well-documented book highlights the nature of the problems and progress of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York City compared with those of such groups of immigrants as the Irish, the Germans, the Italians, and the Jews. The analysis is illuminated by the author's deep understanding of the immigration history of this country. Points out the "circular pattern of frustration" of color prejudice, low income, sporadic and low-skill employment opportunities, and limited education that confront Negroes and Puerto Ricans. However, the author concludes that "although the difficulties are genuine and grave, there is every reason to be optimistic about the future, if the society of which these people have become a part allows them to act freely and as equals in it." (P. 117.)

Jaffe, A. J. (ed.). "Puerto Rican Population of New York City." Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1954. 61 pp.

This booklet contains three excellent papers, delivered before the New York area chapter of the American Statistical Association, Oct. 21, 1953: Jaffe, A. J., "Demographic and Labor Force Characteristics;" Weiner, Louis, "Vital Statistics"; Robison, Sophia, "Social and Welfare Statistics." These outstanding authorities in their respective fields presented and interpreted the most recent data that were available. The papers are documented with many statistical tables. Some intragroup (e.g., Puerto Rican birth and Puerto Rican parentage) and intergroup (e.g., Puerto Rican and white, non-Puerto Rican) comparative data are included.

Mills, C. Wright; Senior, Clarence; and Goldsen, Rose. "The Puerto Rican Journey: New York's Newest Migrant." Harper & Bros., 1950. 238 pp.

A carefully researched field study of the Puerto Rican population in two core areas of New York City. The study was done in 1948 by a research team of the bureau of applied social research of Columbia University. Although many of its statistics are now out of date, the book deals with basic concepts, such as the factors in "adaptation," cultural and language differences, and their influence on the progress and problems of the migrants. Includes much data on the characteristics of the Puerto Ricans in the two core areas—family, age, sex, education, occupation, income, etc.

Morrison, J. Cayce. "The Puerto Rican Study: 1953–57." New York City Board of Education, 1958. 265 pp.

This is the final report of the most complete study of the impact of Puerto Rican migration on the public schools of New York City, and how the schools were affecting Puerto Rican children and their parents. Though sponsored by the New York City Board of Education, a matching grant-in-aid of half a million dollars from the Fund for the Advancement of Education made the study possible. Several specialized studies were done within the framework of the large-scale study. These smaller studies focused on the "sociocultural adjustment" of the children and their parents, and digests of them are presented in this final report. In addition, about a third of the book deals with the special non-English-speaking program developed by the city school system. A description of some of the methods and materials developed is included. The study discovered some unresolved problems in the areas of learning, effective grouping of pupils, staffing those schools with Puerto Rican children, and teacher education. The study led to many research and curriculum publications, and 23 major recommendations, all designed to achieve three purposes: "* * * (developing) better understanding of the children being taught, (relating) the teaching of English to the child's cultural-social adjustment, (improving) the integration of ethnic groups through the school's program" (p. 247). With respect to the children, the major conclusion is contained in the following statement: "The children of Puerto Rican background are exceedingly heterogeneous. This is true of their native intelligence, their prior schooling, their aptitude for learning English, and their scholastic ability * * *" (p. 239).

Padilla, Elena. "Up From Puerto Rico." Columbia University Press, 1958. 317 pp.

The only cultural anthropological study of Puerto Rican migrants in New York City. Padilla directed the study made during the mid-1950's in a small section of Manhattan. The research team became acquainted with over 500 residents of the area—not all of them Puerto Rican. After 18 months of observing, conversing, listening, and participating in some of the community life the researchers did a long open-ended questionnaire interview with 48 Puerto Rican family heads. They found Puerto Ricans making a rapid transition from traditional island cultural patterns; to be confronted with many problems, among these being the prejudiced treatment of them by some non-Puerto Rican New Yorkers; and, to feel that the struggle is worth it for the sake of their children. In light of the limited sample and the lack of quantified conclusions, care should be taken not to use the experiences reported in this book as a basis for generalizations about all persons of Puerto Rican origin who were living in New York City in the mid-1950's.

Rand, Christopher. "The Puerto Ricans." Oxford University Press, 1958. 178 pp.

Journalistic report, engagingly written and marked by a real warmth of feeling for Puerto Ricans and Puerto Rico. Marred by playing up the "colorful" and the picturesque. An expanded account of the material first published in The New Yorker, Nov. 30–Dec. 21, 1957. (A series of four articles.)

Reynolds, Lloyd G., and Gregory, Peter. "Wages, Productivity, and Industrialization in Puerto Rico." Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1965. 357 pp.

"Omitting men who had been abroad for military service, we found that about one-eighth of both the men and women in our sample (of industrial workers) had lived on the mainland for some time. More than three-quarters of those who had gone to the mainland said they had done so with the express purpose of seeking employment, believing that jobs were more plentiful and better paying than in Puerto Rico. During the relevant time period—the late forties and early fifties—this impression was undoubtedly correct. A large majority of these people (90 percent of the men and 80 percent of the women) were employed in Puerto Rico at the time of emigration. This suggests that the movement was not a desperate effort to escape from unemployment but rather a rational attempt to maximize incomes. *Noteworthy also* is the relatively high skill level of the returned migrants. Of the men who had had mainland factory experience, 53 percent were in skilled jobs in Puerto Rico at the time of interview. This is well above the 30 percent of skilled men in the sample as a whole. "The hypothetical questions put to all members of the sample revealed a strong latent 'propensity to migrate.' Two-thirds of the men and three-quarters of the women who had never been to the mainland expressed interest in going, and 80 percent of these thought they would like to migrate permanently or to try mainland living with this end in mind. The reasons given were predominantly economic * * * "

Senior, Clarence. "Our Citizens From The Carribbean." McGraw-Hill, 1965. 122 pp.

Deals with interrelated strands of United States and Puerto Rican history, the occupation of the island, and the changes it helped produce. Includes description and interpretation of the political and social evolution, economic development, population problems, and the migration. There is also a chapter on Cuba and Cubans in the United States. Designed for high school students, it is a useful introduction to the subject for any reader.

Senior, Clarence. "Puerto Rican Migration." University of Puerto Rico, Social Science Research Center, 1947. 166 pp.

One of the earliest accounts of Puerto Rican migration and a basis for further research analyses of statistical data and policy formulation.

Senior, Clarence. "The Puerto Ricans: Strangers—Then Neighbors." Quadrangle Books, 1965. 128 pp.

Revised, updated edition of an attempt to draw parallels between past immigrations and present internal migrations on one hand and the migration of the Puerto Ricans on the other. First edition published in 1961. In his foreword, Vice President Hubert Humphrey writes, "This book dispels, with facts, many myths about the Puerto Ricans * * *" An unfortunate publisher's blurb incorrectly contradicts the author's text by calling Puerto Rican migrants "the largest immigrating group in the Nation today."

Sexton, Patricia. "Spanish Harlem: Anatomy of Poverty." Harper & Row, 1965. 208 pp.

Report by a sociologist who spent part of 2 years "getting acquainted" with East Harlem. Shows awareness that she is dealing with the pathologies of a minority of the area's population ("still, the majority of the people are self-supporting"). However, she does not gloss over the problems that confront many of the self-supporting, low-income urban dwellers. The book is informed by the important insight of the need for "the poor" to be involved in working out their destiny.

Thieme, Frederick P. "The Puerto Rican Population: A Study in Human Biology." University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology, 1959. 156 pp. +139 tables and 76 charts.

A field study of 3,562 Puerto Ricans as a sample of the island's population. Reports on blood types, nutrition, anthropometric measurements, dental conditions, intestinal infestations, and other physical aspects. Migrants are measured, directly (in the case of returnees) and indirectly (through same-sex siblings). Compared with sedentes, "shows the migrant to be 'whiter' and less negroid, and to be better nourished, but of comparable age." (p. 149.)

Wakefield, Dan. "Island in the City: Puerto Ricans in New York." Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959. 278 pp.

Journalistic account of "the world of Spanish Harlem." Includes many sophisticated basic insights gained from living in East Harlem. However, tends to overemphasize the more gaudy or sensational aspects such as spiritualism, narcotics rackets, and gang fights.